

## NASDCTEc BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FY 15-16

### NASDCTEc President

Mr. Rod Duckworth  
Chancellor  
Division of Career and Adult Education  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 744  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400  
Phone: 850-245-9047  
Fax: 850-245-9065  
Email: rod.duckworth@fldoe.org

### NASDCTEc Vice President

Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt  
Director, Career and Technical Education  
North Carolina Department of Public  
Instruction  
6361 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-6361  
Phone: 919-807-3764  
Fax: 919-807-3899  
Email: joanne.honeycutt@dpi.nc.gov

### Secretary / Treasurer

Dr. Pradeep Kotamraju  
Director, Career and Technical Education  
Bureau Chief  
Division of Community Colleges  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 East 14th Avenue  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
Phone: 515-281-4716  
Fax: 515-242-5988  
Email: pradeep.kotamraju@iowa.gov

### NASDCTEc Past President

Ms. Marie Barry  
Director  
Office of Career and Technical Education  
New Jersey Department of Education  
100 Riverview Plaza  
P.O. Box 500  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
Phone: 609-633-0665  
Fax: 609-984-5347  
Email: marie.barry@doe.state.nj.us

Ms. Vanessa Cooley  
State Career and Technical Education  
Administrator  
Rhode Island Department of Education  
255 Westminster Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Phone: 401-222-8438  
Fax: 401-222-2537  
Email: vanessa.cooley@ride.ri.gov  
**Region I** - Connecticut; Maine;  
Massachusetts; New Hampshire; Rhode  
Island; Vermont  
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017

Ms. Marie Barry  
Director, Office of Career and Technical  
Education  
New Jersey Department of Education  
100 Riverview Plaza  
P.O. Box 500  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
Phone: 609-633-0665  
Fax: 609-984-5347  
Email: marie.barry@doe.state.nj.us  
**Region II** - New York; New Jersey; Puerto  
Rico; Virgin Islands  
Term: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018

Dr. Lee Burket  
Director, Bureau of Career and Technical  
Education  
Pennsylvania Department of Education  
333 Market Street 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17126  
Phone: 717-787-5530  
Fax: 717-783-6672  
Email: lburket@pa.gov  
**Region III** - Delaware; District of  
Columbia; Maryland; Pennsylvania;  
Virginia; West Virginia  
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017

Ms. Jean Massey  
Associate Superintendent  
Mississippi Department of Education  
Office of Vocational and Workforce  
Development  
359 North West Street, PO Box 771  
Jackson, MS 39205  
Phone: 601-359-3090  
Fax: 601-359-6619  
Email: jmassey@mde.k12.ms.us  
**Region IV** - Alabama; Florida; Georgia;  
Kentucky; Mississippi; North Carolina;  
South Carolina; Tennessee  
Term: July 1, 2013– June 30, 2016

Ms. Kathleen Cullen  
Provost and Vice President of Student  
Success  
Wisconsin Technical College System  
4622 University Avenue, PO Box 7874  
Madison, WI 53707-7874  
Phone: 608-266-9399  
Fax: 608-266-1285  
Email: Kathleen.cullen@wtcsystem.edu  
**Region V** - Illinois; Indiana; Minnesota;  
Michigan; Ohio; Wisconsin  
Term: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2016

Mr. Eric Spencer  
State CTE Director  
College and Career Readiness Bureau  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
120 South Federal Place, Room 207  
Mailing; 300 Don Gaspar  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
Phone: 505-827-1808  
Fax: 505-827-1820  
Email: eric.spencer@state.nm.us  
**Region VI** - Texas; Arkansas; Louisiana;  
Oklahoma; New Mexico  
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017

Mr. Richard Katt  
State CTE Director  
Career Education  
Nebraska Department of Education  
301 Centennial Mall South  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Phone: 402-471-4808  
Fax: 402-471-2545  
Email: rich.katt@nebraska.gov  
**Region VII** - Iowa; Kansas; Missouri;  
Nebraska  
Term: July 1, 2015– June 30, 2018

Mr. Wayne Kutzer  
State CTE Director  
Department of Career and Technical  
Education  
600 East Boulevard Avenue  
Bismarck, ND 58505  
Phone: 701-328-2259  
Fax: 701-328-1255  
Email: wkutzer@nd.gov  
**Region VIII** - Colorado; Utah; North  
Dakota; Montana; South Dakota; Wyoming  
Term: July 1, 2013– June 30, 2016

Mr. Mike Raponi  
State CTE Director  
Nevada Department of Education  
Office of Career Technical & Adult  
Education  
755 N. Roop Street Suite 201  
Carson City, NV 89701  
Phone: 775-687-7283  
Fax: 775-687-8636  
Email: mraponi@doe.nv.gov  
**Region IX** - Arizona; California; Nevada  
Term: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018

Ms. Eleni Papadakis  
Executive Director  
Workforce Training & Education  
Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 43105  
Olympia, WA 98504  
Phone: 360-753-5662  
Fax: 360-586-5862  
Email: epapadakis@wtb.wa.gov  
**Region X** – Alaska; Idaho; Oregon;  
Washington  
**Term:** July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018

Ms. Bernadette Howard  
State CTE Director  
Career and Technical Education  
University of Hawaii  
Lower Campus Road  
Lunalilo Portable 1  
Honolulu, HI 96822-2849  
Phone: 808-956-4791  
Fax: 808-956-9096  
Email: mbhoward@hawaii.edu  
**Region XI** - Hawaii; Commonwealth of  
Northern Marianas; Federated States of  
Micronesia; Republic of the Marshall  
Islands; Republic of Palau; Guam;  
American Samoa  
**Term:** July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017

Dr. Sheila K. Ruhland  
President  
Tacoma Community College  
6501 S. 19<sup>th</sup> Street  
Tacoma, WA 98466  
Phone: 253-566-5100  
Fax: 253-566-5100  
Email: sruhland@tacomacc.edu  
**Associate Member Representative**  
**Term:** July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017

NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Conference Call  
**MINUTES**  
October 22, 2015 4-5 p.m. ET

---

**Attendees:** Rod Duckworth, Marie Barry, Pradeep Kotamraju, Vanessa Cooley, Lee Burket, Wayne Kutzer, Mike Raponi, Eleni Papadakis, Bernadette Howard, Tim Hodges, Cheryl Carrier  
**Absent:** Jo Anne Honeycutt, Jean Massey, Kathleen Cullen, Eric Spencer, Sheila Ruhland  
**Staff:** Kimberly Green, Karen Hornberger, Kate Blosveren, Katie Fitzgerald

**Welcome and Overview of Agenda:** Kotamraju welcomed the NASDCTEc Board and staff to the NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Meeting. Hornberger took a roll call of the NASDCTEc Board and confirmed attendance.

**Review and Approval of NASDCTEc Board Minutes:** Kotamraju presented the minutes from the September 25, 2015, NASDCTEc Board of Directors' conference call.

**MOTION: To approve the September 25, 2015 NASDCTEc Board of Directors' Conference Call Minutes as presented.  
Howard; Barry.  
MOTION ADOPTED.**

**Summit Debrief:** Green asked if the Future of CTE Summit met the Board's expectations, and was it a productive use of their time. Kutzer noted he was at the last Summit and there was a similar process but he enjoyed interacting with so many different people from different organizations. He found there were great conversations and enjoyed the process. While some of the conversations were uncomfortable, he recognizes sometimes you need to get a little uncomfortable to come up with new ideas.

Cooley shared that she enjoyed the process and thought PwC did a great job of moving people around and setting up a range of interactions. Kotamraju stated that he also enjoyed the process and noted it was very interesting to see PowerPoint slides (used during the Design Team meetings) coming to life. He did share the concern that often earlier groups were the boldest and then ideas got watered down as the Summit went on. Barry stated that she agreed with Kotamraju and added that having outside/external stakeholders as part of the discussion really enhanced the event, focusing us to look outside of ourselves and to think different. Barry also noted her colleague also loved the process and was very impressed.

Katt stated that he agreed on the value of the diversity of participants, which enhanced the discussion. He also noted that he felt that we went further in the process than the last Summit.

Carrier shared that it felt like it took a little while to get "bolder" but she did notice that there was some regression in the level of boldness as the Summit went on. She stated that initially, a lot of people thought it was 'out there' but they generally came along with the idea that we could change perceptions and shake things up.

Green said that may have been because once we started asking for action steps on day 3, participants got a little less bold and started thinking about barriers and what is possible rather than what could be possible. Kotamraju commended Green with the last minute suggestion to

have a “go bolder” working group – for folks who wanted to push even further. There seemed to be a lot of energy toward that group.

Green asked if there is anything we should have done differently? Anything we should consider as we move forward into the next steps?

Raponi noted that he attended both Summits, which he sees as such a unique process. PwC took brainstorming to an exponential level. His favorite part was the one-on-one interview, as it was mechanically extrapolated into bigger groups. He also shared that there are some key documents that are so well developed on issues like career guidance, accountability, etc. that could be used as starting points for future discussions. Green suggested maybe we create a library of resources to go along with the final vision.

Duckworth shared that this was his first summit so he was new to the process. He really liked the process and how it was very open. He noted more business/industry would have been good and overall it was a good meeting.

Cooley agreed that more business/industry participation would have been good, but appreciated how much they were considered in the discussions.

Green also agreed that we would have preferred more employers. She shared that we had the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation as a co-convenor, but many of the employers we and co-conveners invited declined the invitation. She noted that we will be diligent about engaging employers in the next steps. Carrier committed to helping engage more employers in the process.

Hodges shared that he thought that only having names on the name tags was helpful. He stated that in some groups, there were no introductions that facilitated open conversations. In groups where people did introduce themselves, we lost a little bit of that openness and willingness to challenge assumptions.

Blosveren walked through early finds from the evaluations:

- One quarter of participants have responded to the evaluation so far.
- 95% responded event met objectives. Handouts were effective. Physical environment was conducive to environment. (1-2 people remained neutral)
- Some thought the Summit could have gone bolder.
- PwC was popular; people liked no titles, liked random pairings.
- People didn't like: days were long, not enough opportunities for reflection, more structured networking.
- People want to remain engaged.
- Number of State CTE Directors want to replicate the process at their state/local level
- We may provide something at the spring meeting around suggested materials/activities, etc.

**Proposed timeline and process for the new vision:** Green noted that we are already seeing dividends in partnerships with co-conveners and positioning at the national level. She also shared that PwC's involvement ends after tomorrow's design team call; they are not responsible

for the development of the vision document. Green shared that while our initial plan was to share the vision at our Spring meeting in May 2016, there appears to be too much urgency to wait that long. Therefore, we are looking at an earlier release date. She stated that our strategy will be to have each co-convenor continue to play a role in the vision development by having one person from each co-convenor organization to serve on the writing team.

Green reported that the staff will be crafting a summary to share high-level outcomes with participants as well to those members and partners who did not attend. She stated that the final big buckets explored on day three will be used as a framing or outline. Green also noted that the staff will also be looking at all inputs (from all three days) because in some cases there are bolder ideas in earlier activities. The target release goal is currently the first quarter of 2016. The release will include a new vision with principles and actions among stakeholders, and, ideally, some clarity about roles for each of the co-convening organizations and their members.

Green shared that the plan to have an executive director-level meeting for all co-convenors to plan out at what level of commitment they want to have to this vision. Ideally, we'd like to have each organization endorse/sign on to the vision as well as map out how their existing work aligns and what new work they will take on that aligns. The staff is tentatively thinking about a release date of March. The staff is also working now to figure out the best way to share the raw information with participants and other members/partners in a way that is transparent but also streamlined and honors the process. Duckworth encouraged the staff to be as transparent with members as possible, especially in the run up to our spring meeting. He noted he is comfortable with moving up the timeline.

Kotamraju agreed that we should be communicating often on the process and progress. Green shared we'll likely have two strategies – one for those who attended the Summit and one for those who were not at the Summit. She noted that it is important to honor the work done at the Summit, but also to vet it with those who were not able to attend.

Raponi asked about communications with those who attended. Green shared that the staff will have a set of planned communications, and will be sharing the concept cards, photos of the work produces at the Summit, resources, summaries, etc. This will likely include materials that will not be made available to the public, as the context of participation at the Summit will be key to the utility and understanding of these assets.

**Rebranding Next Steps:** Blosveren shared the proposed timeline and process for the rebranding. She proposed how we are transitioning to the new name and how we want it to be impactful and successful.

Blosveren shared that we are in Phase I now, which includes having communicated to our members, updated partners who we've communicated with but we have not transitioned to any formal branding yet. Moving to Phase II, includes developing brand guidelines for Advance CTE: Learning that works for America, mapping our assets and resources, determining what is new that we need to create, creating a toolkit of materials to help tell the story of the new brand and what this brand means. Blosveren shared that we are aiming for the new logo and brand guidelines to be completed in November. The plan is to have a variety of materials including webinar, media engagement, press release, FAQs, and one-pagers to tell the story. She shared that the goal is to have a hard launch in January as the New Year is a good time to turn over with a fresh start.

Cooley shared that she heard some concerns about new branding and asked whether we should wait until the spring meeting. Green and Duckworth noted that it's important we know about the concerns so we can address them proactively as we plan our roll out. Kutzer shared that he did not hear anything negative.

Green shared that the staff plan to use the Communications Committee as a sounding board for the roll out strategy and development of resources. The plan is to shift more of the hands on feedback from the Board to the Communications Committee given they have specific skills and expertise in this area. The Communication Committee will be much more heavily engaged in providing input along the way. Green asked if the Board is comfortable with that shift.

Burket noted that the Board should still be engaged. Katt agreed that the Communications Committee is probably better positioned to provide input, but that the Board should be kept in the loop. Green agreed to keep the Board up to date on the branding communication and shared that any Board member is welcome to join the Communicates Committee.

**Budget Modification:** Green presented the budget modification stating that when we created the budget for NASDCTEc FY 16 we did not anticipate the rebrand of NASDCTEc. Therefore, in order to effectuate the transition to the “DBA”, a budget modification is being submitted for Board consideration and action.

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Legal Fees	\$2,000	Covers the legal research to be conducted, filing fees, etc.
Consulting	\$6,000	Fratelli Communication (1/2 of contract costs) plus design firm to create new logo
Shipping	\$2,200	Shipping of packets re: new brand to membership. Shipping of new assets (letterhead, etc)
Printing	\$2,750	New business cards, letterhead, envelopes, checks, signage for meetings
Supplies	\$1,750	Packaging and branding transition packets/trinket with new name/logo to membership
<b>Total budget modification request</b>	\$14,700	

**MOTION: To approve the budget modification for rebranding as presented.  
Kutzer; Raponi.  
MOTION ADOPTED.**

**Reauthorization Update:** Green shared

- House has a hearing Tuesday – intro on CTE. Not as much collaboration on House side as there is in Senate.
- If Bipartisan bill doesn't move in the House, going to be difficult to get it passed
- Looking at issues around accountability

- Doing a call with ACTE to do a deeper dive into reauthorization for SD who have members who are in the committee. Outreach has been made to those individuals. Board welcome to join. Going to be an off the record call.

**Other Updates:** Green shared that JP Morgan Chase will be making a significant investment in Career Technical Education/Career Readiness. The funds will go toward system-wide/statewide transformative efforts. NASDCTEc is at the table with CCSSO as a key partner in developing process, RFP and as a primary technical assistance provider. We anticipate a fairly significant contract to be coming our way to support our role in this work.

Duckworth thanked Green for the update. Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.



## State Dues Concept Proposal

*Report submitted by Karen Hornberger, Finance and Office Manager  
and Kimberly Green, Executive Director*

---

**Background on State Membership Dues:** State membership is open to Perkins eligible agencies in each state/territory. The dues are voted on annually by our Board of Directors and reflect a formula that takes into consideration the percentage of Perkins funding a state received in the anchor year of 1994.

Last year, a State Director asked the Secretary/Treasurer why spring and fall meeting registration fees are not covered by the dues a state pays to NASDCTEc. A response was compiled and shared at the 2015 Spring Business Meeting. Here is an excerpt of relevant considerations that were shared when answering this question:

- If NASDCTEc were to absorb the registration fees, this would be an average annual expense of \$140,000.
- This additional expense would require NASDCTEc to take the funds from reserves to cover the expense or increase state dues to cover the direct costs.
- Meeting registrations are not a revenue generator for NASDCTEc. Essentially the registration fee equals the per participant direct costs for the meeting (e.g. meals, hotel charges, audio visual, printing, speakers, etc). This means that state dues cover the staffing expenses for the meetings.

When this information was presented to the membership, it was decided not to pursue a waiver of registration fees but instead staff was asked to explore ways to assist states in streamlining their payments to NASDCTEc. Therefore, this proposal is not about cost savings to states but instead it is about giving states the option to consolidate their dues and registration fees into a single, annual payment.

### **Proposal:**

Each state would be given the option to increase its state dues to cover the registration fee for one individual to attend the spring and fall meetings. Currently this equals \$1,000, which is the on-time member registration rate for each meeting.

Here are some of the proposed policy guidelines:

- This registration could be used for the State Director or anyone else the State Director/state would choose to designate for the registration.
- The state would indicate its intent to take advantage of this option via the state dues intent form.
- State would be given one opportunity a year to take advantage of this benefit, when state dues are invoiced.
- To have this benefit activated, full payment of the state's dues must be received prior to the fall meeting registration deadline.

- If a state fails to use one or both of its registrations, the funds cannot be redirected to purchase other products or services (e.g. the Career Cluster products).
- Funds are not refundable and cannot be carried forward to another fiscal year.

**Benefits and Risks to Association:**

- This reduces processing fees/time for NASDCTEc and might make travel approval/participation easier for states.
- Budgeting for upcoming fiscal year is made easier and more accurate.
- States will always pay the member on-time rate for each of the meetings – losing an additional income if the state normally pays the higher (non-early bird) registration fee.
- Income is received in advance of both meetings, therefore are in the Association’s accounts and accruing interest for a longer period of time.

**Benefits and Risks to States:**

- This could make travel approval/participation easier for states.
- States will always pay the member on –time rate for each of the meetings currently \$500 per meeting.
- Prepaid registration fees cannot be carried forward to another fiscal year nor redirected to other expenses or services (e.g. Career Cluster products)
- Registration fees can however be transferred to the State Directors’ proxy if the State Director cannot attend.
- If a state does not send someone to a meeting, it will forfeit the full registration fee.

**Questions:**

- Are we comfortable with including registration fees with annual dues?
- Would we want to allow a state wants to pre-pay for more than one registration?
- Should we have other guidelines or policies in place?

**Proposed FY17 State Dues**  
*Submitted by Kimberly Green, Executive Director*

---

In 1994, the Board and membership approved a policy to annually increase the state dues by the consumer price index (CPI). Since 1994, the staff has analyzed the annual percentage gain of the CPI from December to December. This percentage gain is the amount that is brought to the Board for confirmation as the percentage the dues should increase the following fiscal year.

The December 2014 to December 2015 CPI increase is 0.7%. This represents an increase of \$3,770 over FY16, bringing total proposed invoiced state dues to \$542,369.

**Action:** Vote to approve the FY17 state dues.

<b>State Name</b>	<b>Approved FY16 Dues</b>	<b>CPI Increase 0.70%</b>	<b>Proposed FY17 Dues</b>
Alabama	\$12,280	\$86	\$12,366
Alaska	\$4,745	\$33	\$4,779
Arizona	\$10,315	\$72	\$10,387
Arkansas	\$9,541	\$67	\$9,608
California	\$16,380	\$115	\$16,495
Colorado	\$9,767	\$68	\$9,835
Connecticut	\$9,093	\$64	\$9,156
Delaware	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
District of Columbia	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Florida	\$15,014	\$105	\$15,119
Georgia	\$14,338	\$100	\$14,439
Hawaii	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Idaho	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Illinois	\$15,258	\$107	\$15,364
Indiana	\$14,114	\$99	\$14,213
Iowa	\$9,993	\$70	\$10,063
Kansas	\$8,850	\$62	\$8,912
Kentucky	\$12,167	\$85	\$12,252
Louisiana	\$13,197	\$92	\$13,289
Maine	\$7,706	\$54	\$7,760
Maryland	\$10,908	\$76	\$10,984
Massachusetts	\$12,971	\$91	\$13,061
Michigan	\$14,792	\$104	\$14,896
Minnesota	\$11,600	\$81	\$11,681
Mississippi	\$10,216	\$72	\$10,288
Missouri	\$12,730	\$89	\$12,819
Montana	\$5,170	\$36	\$5,206
Nebraska	\$7,949	\$56	\$8,005
Nevada	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
New Hampshire	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
New Jersey	\$14,005	\$98	\$14,103
New Mexico	\$8,175	\$57	\$8,232
New York	\$15,931	\$112	\$16,043
North Carolina	\$14,565	\$102	\$14,667
North Dakota	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Ohio	\$15,482	\$108	\$15,590
Oklahoma	\$10,315	\$72	\$10,387
Oregon	\$9,319	\$65	\$9,384
Pennsylvania	\$15,708	\$110	\$15,818
Rhode Island	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
South Carolina	\$11,363	1/26/2016 \$80	\$11,442

<b>State Name</b>	<b>Approved FY16 Dues</b>	<b>CPI Increase 0.70%</b>	<b>Proposed FY17 Dues</b>
South Dakota	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Tennessee	\$13,422	\$94	\$13,516
Texas	\$16,158	\$113	\$16,271
Utah	\$8,400	\$59	\$8,459
Vermont	\$5,170	\$36	\$5,206
Virginia	\$13,648	\$96	\$13,743
Washington	\$11,135	\$78	\$11,213
West Virginia	\$8,626	\$60	\$8,687
Wisconsin	\$12,502	\$88	\$12,590
Wyoming	\$5,167	\$36	\$5,203
Guam	\$695	\$5	\$700
Palau	\$695	\$5	\$700
Puerto Rico	\$11,831	\$83	\$11,914
Virgin Islands	\$695	\$5	\$700
<b>TOTAL:</b>	\$538,599	\$3,770	\$542,370
Reference for CPI Rate: <a href="http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUUR0000SA0?output_view=pct_12mths">http://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CUUR0000SA0?output_view=pct_12mths</a>			