

Advance CTE Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES
BWI Marriott Hotel
Linthicum Heights, Maryland
October 17, 2016

Attendees: Marie Barry, Lee Burket, Charisse Childers, Philip Cleveland, Kathleen Cullen, Rod Duckworth, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Rich Katt, Pradeep Kotamraju, Thalea Longhurst, Jean Massey, Eleni Papadakis, Sheila Ruhland

Absent: Vanessa Cooley, Bernadette Howard, Mike Raponi

Staff attending: Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Steve Voytek, and Andrea Zimmermann

Welcome and Overview of Agenda: Honeycutt welcomed the Advance CTE Board and staff to the Fall Advance CTE Board of Directors' meeting. Honeycutt recognized new Board members Charisse Childers of Arkansas (Region VI) and Thalea Longhurst (Region VIII), and welcomed new officer, Philip Cleveland, who will serve as Secretary/Treasurer. She also noted that Region IX Board member, Mike Raponi of Nevada, notified the Board of his intent to retire on October 31, 2016. Staff will work to identify a candidate for the vacancy, and will send Board members an electronic ballot soon.

Review and Approval of Advance CTE Board Minutes: Cleveland presented the minutes from the June 23, 2016, Advance CTE Board of Directors' meeting. No corrections were made.

**MOTION: To approve the June 23, 2016, Advance CTE Board Minutes.
Papadakis; Burket.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Approval of the Consent Agenda: Honeycutt presented the consent agenda and asked if any items should be removed for discussion. No items were identified.

Honeycutt noted that the large consent agenda offers a glimpse into the volume of work the association does. Ruhland said that staff should be congratulated not only on the numerous projects and partnerships they manage, but also the way that they package and communicate about this work to members.

**MOTION: To approve the Consent Agenda.
Barry; Ruhland.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Approval of the FY16 Financial Reports: Cleveland presented the FY16 financial reports, and noted that the association's finances are strong and diversified. The fiscal year ended with all states paying dues. Income, outside of reserve withdrawals (which were not needed) and expenses, were on target with a few minor exceptions.

Kotamraju asked Green to provide an update about replacing the staff member responsible for the organizations' day-to-day financial matters. Green said that Karen Hornberger was with the organization for seven years, but in July, accepted a position closer to her home. In August, staff interviewed a slate of candidates and selected a replacement. However, that replacement did not work out. Green noted that staff have stepped up to fill the gaps, as she thinks through how to recast the position for the right candidate and consider how to cover other needs with outside professional supports, such as the accountant taking on more tasks in the interim. Hornberger is on contract through the end of 2016 to assist with the FY16 annual audit, since it was primarily her work that is being audited, and to provide additional support during the time of transition.

**MOTION: To approve the Advance CTE FY 16 financial reports, as presented.
Katt; Massey.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Approval of the FY17 Financial Reports: Cleveland also provided an update on the FY17 financial reports through October 1, 2016. The report to the Board had noted that annual dues from Alaska were unlikely for FY 17. However, Green reported that since submitting that report, Alaska's dues have been received, thus maintaining 50-state membership for five years.

Green also reported that sponsorships for the 2016 Fall Meeting were lower than projected in the budget but that targets for meeting attendance were met. She also noted that in FY17, the reimbursement by the Foundation to the Association for staff salaries and benefits would take place on a quarterly basis. Also, the Foundation financials, as is always the case, are available on the Board Portal for any Board member to review.

Honeycutt said she has appreciated the intentional fundraising efforts by staff, and that the fundraising efforts have continued to stay true to the organization's mission and vision while also adding much-needed capacity for staff.

**MOTION: To approve the Advance CTE FY 17 financial reports as presented.
Duckworth; Papadakis.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

State Membership and Governance Discussion: During the February 2016 Board Retreat, Board members began a discussion regarding the governance of Advance CTE, particularly as it relates to the structure of its Board. In the months since, a task force comprised of Board members was established to further develop and discuss various proposals to restructure the Board.

Honeycutt reminded the Board that this effort was in response to membership requests, as well as Board members who have noted the challenge the current imposes on some regions (given size

of the region and State Director turnover). When thinking about the Board's composition, the taskforce faced the issue of who Board members represent and whether the current Board structure and by extension, membership structure fully reflect, the new brand (state CTE leaders), mission and vision. Further, the taskforce raised the aspirations of "Putting Learner Success First," which calls for cross-sector coordination and systems alignment.

Honeycutt walked through the work that has been accomplished thus far. In FY16, the Board authorized a pilot that provided one complimentary membership to be assigned by the State Director as part of the Future to CTE Summit. The Board extended the pilot for FY17 with the agreement that we'd need a resolution prior to invoicing for states FY18 dues.

In this meeting, Board members debated three scenarios as separate groups, and then came together to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each.

In Group 1, in which the pilot would end and the membership structure shift back to the state membership providing services to just the State CTE Director, Papadakis said none of the members of her group agreed that this should happen. A slight advantage was the "purity" of having the state membership only rest with the State Director, but this advantage was fleeting, she said.

In Group 2, in which the Board would formalize the pilot (state dues provide services to the State Director and one other state agency employee identified by the State Director), Barry and the members of her group agreed that the pilot was a success, with 33 states participating and seeing the value of having an additional partner as part of their membership. However, soon the discussion turned to who that person should be – a secondary or postsecondary counterpart who is already bought in, or perhaps someone who would benefit from the exposure to CTE at a national level such as a governor's policy advisor – and whether one partner was enough. The group recommended that there should be some language or perhaps guidance about who should receive the complimentary membership. Although group 2's scenario meant a small loss in revenue, all participants thought the value of having a partner would offset the loss.

In Group 3, in which the state membership is expanded to cover as many as five members including the State Director, the group participants noted that this proposal would truly advance the concept of building a state team. Ruhland, an associate member, also said this proposal best represents the association's new name and tagline, "State CTE Leaders: Connecting Learning to Work" by moving toward a broader view of state leadership. Within this group, participants discussed the make-up of the five teammates, how they would be named and other impacts such as the registration and structure of the organization's bi-annual conference.

Barry noted that given the association's financial strength, this state team concept would provide an opportunity to leverage those reserves to offset the minor financial impact of losing some associate memberships.

She also suggested that the Board must provide guidance about the team compositions but also be flexible to accommodate various state structures and contexts.

Honeycutt asked whether states could pay to have members beyond their five spots, which would be a parallel structure to the current organizational membership. Katt echoed that this would be a good option and would still have them be seen as part of the state team. Katt also raised the idea that state teams could receive a discount if they register as a team for the conferences.

Cleveland noted that given that this proposal would also grow the membership considerably, the Association and Board should be prepared to grow its staff to best manage and support all of the new members.

After taking an informal poll of the Board members, Honeycutt announced that the third scenario – a state team concept of five members including and identified by the State Director – was the prevailing consensus. From there, the Board discussed other implications and decision points including the composition of the teams and the guidance needed, but ultimately directed staff to draw up proposed guidance and bring it to the Board for consideration at its January meeting.

Barry raised a question about the proposed language, which is based on the existing pilot structure and is limited the state team members to Associate-State members. However, given the postsecondary structure in New Jersey, which doesn't have a state-level system but rather the counterpart comes from a local community college. As such, the New Jersey postsecondary counterpart qualifies as an Associate-Non State member.

The Board agreed that the future guidance and language should leave it open to Associate-Non State members (but not organizational members). Honeycutt asked staff to draft “loose-and-tight” guidance that includes guiding questions about how to best represent the educational continuum, cultivate future CTE leadership, and how states can add additional members beyond their allotted five.

Green asked the Board for input on how the “team” concept should impact future in-person professional development convenings such as the bi-annual conferences. Massey noted that the team approach at meetings would be nice to also have dedicated time for the team members to meet together and plan. Honeycutt also encouraged role-alike groupings that allows the state team members to learn from peers in other states.

The Board agreed to share the high-level update with all members at the Advance CTE Business Meeting on October 18, 2016 and directed staff to conduct a webinar for State Directors to better communicate about these changes and gather input regarding the future guidance and composition of the teams. From there, staff and the Board can consider additional communication and input that will be necessary. Katt noted that members' voices would be important to get their buy-in with these changes.

**MOTION: Beginning in FY18, a state’s membership dues will provide a state with membership benefits for up to five individuals, identified by and including the State CTE Director. The individuals identified for membership benefits must qualify as members as described in the state and non-state associate membership categories.
Barry; Papadakis.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

With the new action around the association’s membership structure, Honeycutt asked Board members to think back to the ongoing discussion around the composition of the Advance CTE Board. With 11 regions currently and the high turnover of State Directors, the governance model is a challenge. In May, the Board agreed to move forward with considerations for a five-region model with a range of at-large positions.

Barry asked whether it was important that there isn’t a plurality of representatives from a single state under the new proposal. However, currently there are two members from Washington through the Associate representative position and Region X representative.

Papadakis noted that under the new proposal, regional Board members would have a lot of states to manage, and would the expectations of a Board member change under this proposal. Barry said that with a structure like this that is more regionally representative, there should be more intentionality at in-person convenings to meet with regions, or perhaps Board members could hold a pre-meeting webinar with their regions to solicit input and create a feedback loop with the people they represent.

The discussion led to consensus around two main points:

- Consensus that the newly structured regions meet the taskforce’s guiding and that the Board was comfortable to move forward.
- Consensus that there was general comfort with the proposed at-large positions, with the caveat that the Board composition still maintains a majority State Director voice and creates an expanded voice for non-organizational associate members. Details about the exact at-large positions will be decided later.

Next steps as discussed are to:

- Engage with the full State Director community
- Have staff draft the details about how to operationalize this structure, both for the transition and implementation
- Decide how to communicate these changes to the full membership. Currently, very little has been communicated to the members, and such a change would require a bylaws change and a vote from the members.

Green noted that this change would likely need to go into effect on July 1, 2018, because a tiered phase-in process would be necessary. Green also asked for feedback – in the context of the new state team membership, who would be eligible to serve in the at-large positions: those associate members who are identified for a state team or anyone who signs up individually as a member? The Board affirmed that all members, except for organizational members, would be eligible.

Barry said another future consideration would be to reconsider the current Nominating Committee and process.

Katt asked that staff bring the operationalized process and details such as timeline, transitions, a Q&A, back to the Board for the January meeting and plan to present the full plan to the membership during the Business Meeting in May 2017. Papadakis also noted an idea to think about for future consideration would be some kind of “sponsorship” to ease the travel burden for the under-resourced rural states to encourage their participation on the Board.

CTSO Liaison Discussion: Currently Advance CTE Board members serve as liaisons to four Career Technical Student Organizations (CTSOs), and all four organizations have varying time commitments and role responsibilities. Advance CTE staff attend the quarterly National Coordinating Council of CTSOs, but that participation is too high-level to be considered a replacement for individual liaison positions. Green asked the Board to consider creating a Board policy to create consistency across these liaison positions.

Cullen, who serves as the SkillsUSA liaison, suggested that her term of one year was not long enough to understand how the Board functions and provide a meaningful contribution. SkillsUSA suggested a six-year commitment.

Barry said her time on the National FFA Board, also a one-year commitment, was also too short, but that six years would be far too long. However, perhaps there was a way to re-shape the liaison role to be more than providing a brief update, and could limit the number of meetings that needed to be attended.

Cleveland stressed that maintaining a connection to the CTSOs was critical given their connection with employers and their presence in the states.

Papadakis asked if a State Director who did not serve on the Board could fill this role, but Cullen said the liaison needs to be from the Board as the CTSOs want the liaison to be a voice to and from our organizational leadership.

Honeycutt agreed that scaling back the number of in-person commitments would be helpful and Massey asked if staff could propose a policy for consideration. Green said the Board could consider making a dramatic shift in terms of expectations to maximize the liaisons’ time and influence. For example, Advance CTE could propose a two-way liaison position where the CTSOs report to our Board once a year to get the entire Board’s collective feedback and in return, the Advance CTE liaison will attend an in-person CTSO Board meeting once a year to do the same.

Massey, Cullen and Honeycutt concurred that this would better define roles and responsibilities while also creating a two-way, intentional communication channel.

Perkins Reauthorization: Honeycutt moved that the Board go into executive session at 12:57 p.m.

Executive session ended at 1:17 p.m.

Due to time constraints, Green suggested that the planned Perkins implementation support discussion be held until the federal policy strategy is discussed in the Joint Board meeting.

The Advance CTE Meeting concluded at 1:18 p.m.