

NASDCTEc/NCTEF Board of Directors Conference Call

MINUTES

August 6, 2105 4 – 4:30 p.m. EDT

Participating: Jo Anne Honeycutt, Marie Barry, Pradeep Kotamraju, Wayne Kutzer, Eric Spencer, Bernadette Howard, Eleni Papadakis, Sheila Ruhland, Jean Massey, Mike Raponi, Vanessa Cooley, Tim Hodges, Rich Katt, Cheryl Carrier

Staff: Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Katie Fitzgerald

Guests: Frances Cox, Pete Janhunen

Unable to participate but provided a proxy (proxy noted in parentheses): Rod Duckworth (Jo Anne Honeycutt), Kathleen Cullen (Jo Anne Honeycutt), Lee Burket

Welcome: Honeycutt welcomed the Board and guests to the call.

Roll Call: Green conducted a roll of call Board members in attendance. The roll call results are reflected above.

Presentation of Proposed Short List of Names & Taglines:

Pete Janhunen reviewed the brand platform by way of reminding the Board of the journey that had led to the names being proposed today. He also explained that the proposed names take two directions: one, descriptive, with CTE in the name; and one more aspirational and outcomes-focused, not including CTE in the name.

He then walked through each of the names and accompanying taglines, providing a brief description of each.

The name, Advance CTE, features a forward-looking vision in the word “Advance.” The tagline, State Leaders Connecting Learning to Work, puts state leaders front and center.

The name, CTE America, features the national reach of your advocacy efforts. The tagline, State Leaders Advancing Learning that Works, brings the forward movement with the word “Advancing.”

The name, CTE Works, is a complete sentence that is a definitive statement on the power of CTE. The tagline, State Leaders Advancing Excellence in Action, puts a focus on the high-quality emphasis of your work.

The name, The Learning that Works Consortium, leverages the brand power of “CTE: Learning the Works” for the entire organization. The tagline, State Leaders Advancing CTE, is short, since the name here is a little longer, simple and includes CTE.

Janhunen finished his presentation by noting that these names that are somewhat different than what we've had in the past. Green shared that staff did brainstorming to come up with strengths and weaknesses with potential names.

Advance CTE

- Strength: This name evokes progress. The name also gives us the option of dropping “CTE” in future and just using “Advance,” which can be a powerful name on its own. It also lends itself to strong visual representation.
 - Challenges: There is a group sort of within the CTE space call AdvancED (part of an accrediting body. We also cannot use an acronym since it would be ACTE
- CTE America
 - Strengths: The name demonstrates that we represent all of the states, and has a positive and patriotic connotation.
 - Challenges: Our staff believes it sounds a little bit like a political action committee (PAC). It's also more descriptive rather than active or visionary
 - CTE Works
 - Strengths: Builds on visibility on campaign (alignment with blog, Twitter handle); word “works” has multiple positive meanings; catchy
 - Challenges: Potential brand conflict with the campaign; campaign has been initiative of organization and challenge in avoiding brand confusion; struggled to find a strong tagline; there are other organizations (state-based) with similar names (NC Works, Arkansas Works), which are largely workforce development oriented; potential for this to be an overused/cliché phrase; Minnesota owns cteworks.org
 - The Learning that Works Consortium
 - Strengths: Builds on visibility on campaign; does not include CTE which provides flexibility and is more forward looking; a lot of support/buy-in for the campaign across county with 49 participating states; collective of states under “Learning that Works” consortium
 - Challenges: Brand confusion; quality control given all of the state/local/institutions using affiliated local; may suggest endorsement/affiliation when it isn't there

Board Discussion:

Howard likes “Learning that Works Consortium” the most because of “consortium,” the lack of “CTE” and as a brand that ties us together. She noted she is a bit underwhelmed by the names overall, but is comfortable moving them forward for feedback from members.

Raponi expressed concern that it's difficult for the Board to make a decision on a way forward without having more time to review.

Green described the process moving forward, in terms of the survey which will go out to our full membership to get their feedback on the list of names and taglines. The goal of this survey is to

get a sense of intensity of support or dislike from membership, and make sure we avoid any name(s) that evoke negative responses.

Massey noted it is a good list to move forward and provides a solid set of options.

Raponi asked whether this is the exhaustive list of what the communications firm put forward.

Green shared that Fratelli Group through multiple rounds of revisions offered over 20 names, most of which the staff rejected because none were in the spirit of what we were hoping for. We are happy to share whole list if Board would like, but the list we put forward represents the latest and more thoughtful iteration.

Janhunen shared that a number of names brought up for discussion purposes, and NASDCTEC staff held names accountable for meeting our competing priorities –familiarity with current name/brand, smooth transition from current name to new name, and something that is both descriptive and visionary. He encouraged everyone to imagine the names as something that has to be durable, respectful and aligned with brand promise/personality.

Green noted that we would only advance these names if the Board is comfortable with them; if not, we will need to go back to the drawing board. But, if the names resonate after the Board has a chance to think about them (or with some tweaking), then we should advance them to our membership to see how others feel about them and to gather guidance to make any final adjustments, as needed.

Ruhland said that the list being discussed is in right direction and is confident in the vetting that happened behind the scenes so doesn't need to see the full draft list. She noted that she likes "CTE America" and "Learning that Works Consortium" and that the words "advancing" and shift to "state leaders" both resonate. She also shared that she really likes the choice of words around learning vs. education. She asked if the survey would go out to both state directors and associate members.

Green confirmed that the entire membership will have a chance to weigh in our survey and that the survey will an open question for other name suggestions.

Barry noted she was comfortable with names moving forward and asked for more details on what would be included in the member survey.

Green shared that the survey will not be a vote or a ranking, but rather give members a chance to provide feedback on the names and taglines in terms of their strength of like and dislike and how well they evoke our mission and vision. It will inform any adjustments as well as any names that are truly distasteful to our members.

Raponi asked if we want the name to clarify what we are about for an audience beyond our CTE world and/or if we want the name to include some sort of definition of what we are, such as an association, consortium or both?

Cooley noted that she prefers the taglines to the names.

Papadakis raised the issue that the concept of leadership comes up in taglines, but not in the names. If there were another way to get that concept in the name would be preferable. She was not concerned about any conflict in using 'learning that works,' and noted that it could provide cohesion across the states and community.

Kotamraju said that we should move forward. He likes the use of "advance," but is concerned about people shortening it to "ACTE," which could lead to confusion in the field.

Carrier noted that while at first she was underwhelmed by the options, the more she looked and thought about them, the more she finds she likes. She particularly finds 'Learning that Works Consortium' and "state leaders" positive. She noted that "advance" may position CTE as an underdog, but supports moving forward.

Katt noted that this is a good list to put forward. He likes the word "advance," finding it powerful, bold, and future-looking. He also likes "Learning that Works Consortium" but wonders if it goes far enough.

Spencer agreed with Katt but questioned the term "state leaders," wondering about other partner organizations (SREB, CCSSO) that have state leaders who share our mission/agenda. He questioned whether this phrase gives them a place in our organization or not. He noted that he likes what came together and sees where we can align it to our work and mission.

Green shared next steps. NASDCTEc will share the slide deck and a link to the e-ballot. Board members will be asked to vote on the minutes from the last Board call and to advance the names and taglines to send to the members through a survey to gather additional feedback. She asked that Board members return their votes tomorrow so the survey to members can go out for a week. We will compile feedback and share with executive committee on August 18th and the final vote will be August 26th. We may have additional communication with the Board as needed before the meeting on August 26th.

Honeycutt thanked the Board, particularly for their flexibility and willingness to spend the extra time discussing the critical topic.

Meeting convened at 4:47 p.m.