

Advance CTE Board of Directors' Meeting

MINUTES

March 29, 2017

1 – 2 p.m. ET

Attendees:

Jo Anne Honeycutt, Pradeep Kotamraju, Vanessa Cooley, Marie Barry, Lee Burket, Charisse Childers, Rich Katt, Eleni Papadakis, Bernadette Howard, Rod Duckworth, Sheila Ruhland, Thalea Longhurst

Absent: Kathleen Cullen, Jean Massey

Staff: Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Sherry Quinn

Welcome and Overview of Agenda: Honeycutt welcomed the Advance CTE Board and staff to the March 29, 2018 Advance CTE Board of Directors' meeting held by conference call.

Review and Approval of Advance CTE Board Minutes: Honeycutt presented the minutes from the January 26, 2017 Advance CTE Board of Directors' meeting. No corrections were made.

**MOTION: To approve the January 26, 2017 Advance CTE Board Minutes.
Cooley, Ruhland.
MOTION APPROVED.**

Review and Approval of Advance CTE/Center to Advance CTE Joint Board Minutes: Honeycutt presented the minutes from the January 26, 2017 Advance CTE/Center to Advance CTE Joint Board of Directors' meeting. No corrections were made.

**MOTION: To approve the January 26, 2017 Advance CTE Board Minutes.
Katt, Howard.
MOTION APPROVED.**

Advance CTE Executive Committee Transition: Honeycutt shared that Phillip Cleveland has left his position as the State CTE Director in Alabama. This departure leaves a vacancy in the Advance CTE Executive Committee, as Cleveland served as the organization's Secretary/Treasurer. The Nominating Committee will cultivate a candidate for the office of Vice President and present this individual, along with the Secretary/Treasurer candidates, to the membership for a vote at the May business meeting. Honeycutt expressed her sadness at losing Cleveland as a Board member as he was a great leader, innovator and professional friend; he will be greatly missed by the organization. With Cleveland's transition, we need someone to fulfill the Secretary/Treasurer duties until the end of the fiscal year. Honeycutt asked Kotamraju to serve in this dual role; he graciously agreed.

Advance CTE Governance Proposal: Green provided background on the governance proposal effort, reminding the Board that this effort, which began over a year ago, was to ensure the Board structure fully reflected the new brand (state CTE leaders), mission and vision, and address the challenge the current structure imposes on some regions with a small number of states. Green

also stated the regions were increasingly difficult to fill with eligible State Directors considering the high turnover (13 changes in this year alone). In October, the Board discussed handling the governance and state membership changes at the same time. However, as staff did the outreach and began the work around the new state membership structure, we realized we should address the membership structure first and give ourselves more time to bring the governance proposal forward. Our original plan was to ask the membership to vote on it this May. Green shared that, with support from the Executive Committee, staff now have two proposals for Board input, the proposal the Board discussed last October and a modified version.

Green presented two questions to be presented for the Board's consideration and vote:

1. Do you agree on the slower approach to consider the governance structure and not bring it to the membership until the fall?
2. Does the Board want to bring both the original proposal and an adapted proposal to the membership for consideration or only one and if only one, which of the two proposals?

Green then turned the presentation over to Kreamer.

Kreamer reiterated the challenge faced under the current regional structure, sharing that with such high turnover of State Directors (13 in 2017 already), some of the smaller regional positions are increasingly difficult to fill, including one which is currently vacant due to turnover among all three of the represented states. Some regions are so small, State Directors are perpetually on the Board while other regions see the opposite effect being large they have limited opportunity to participate.

Kreamer shared the proposed Board structure, which was unofficially 'approved' in October 2016. This proposal maintains the four officers for the Executive Committee, with five (5) regionally-selected Regional Representatives from State Directors, plus four (4) At-Large Representatives with one who must be a State Associate Member, one who must be a State Associate or a Non-State Associate Member; one postsecondary/non-secondary representative who can be a State Director, State Associate; or Non-State Associate Member; and one secondary representative who can be a State Director, State Associate or Non-State Associate Member.

Kreamer noted that as staff begin to plan a member engagement and implementation strategy based on this proposal (as the Board directed us), we found that it would actually be a fairly complicated transition given the flexibility with the at-large positions. We also heard the concerns from certain Board members about the dilution of State Directors on the Board. Kreamer shared that our updated proposal aims is a simplified version of the previous proposal. The updated proposal maintains the four officers for the Executive Committee, with five (5) regionally-selected Regional Representatives from State Directors, plus two (2) At-Large State Directors representatives; one (1) At-Large Associate, State Member Representative; and one (1) Associate Member Representative who must be a State Associate or Non-State Associate member (not an organizational member representative).

Kreamer asked if there are any questions.

Ruhland asked how the roles and responsibilities for the At-Large positions would be defined. Kreamer answered that anyone running for an At-Large Board position would be expected to put up a platform, more like what we now ask of those running for an officer position, and the At-Large positions would be on rotating schedules like the regions. Ruhland stated the term “At-Large” needs to be defined. Ruhland also raised the concern that if Advance CTE is having trouble finding 13 State Directors to serve on the Board, will we be able to find 11 under the new proposal? She urged the Board to not lose sight of recruitment challenges. Ruhland then stated those were her comments, and we could move on.

Barry addressed the difference in the two proposals around loosening the secondary and postsecondary requirements, which she noted could be handled by thinking about term limits of At-Large members. Barry also stated the nomination process needs revisiting to help ensure the Board represents all states and needs. Barry stated she supports the second, updated option but the details need to be flushed out.

Longhurst asked about term limits, and Kreamer stated we would continue to have three-year terms, but how many one person could serve has not yet been defined. This change will need to be updated in the bylaws. Longhurst stated the representatives need to be voted back in for second and Kreamer agreed there would be a revote, and that on the Center side we have two-term limits that could be replicated on the Advance CTE Board side. Papadakis shared that she likes having the State Directors required to create a position or platform to run as At-Large, which requires them to state their commitment and vision to organization.

Kreamer asked if there were any other questions; since there were none, Kreamer asked about the proposed timeline and if the Board was comfortable moving on the timeline with the full membership approving the new structure in October? If so, we will need a Board meeting in August to review the proposed bylaw changes, and time during the business meeting in May to get member feedback on the proposal, as well as additional outreach to members over the summer.

Pradeep asked if the proposal would be sent to members before the May meeting. Kreamer replied whatever the Board decides is the approach they want to pursue, the staff would send out the materials necessary to review in April before the spring meeting.

Ruhland recommended one proposal, not two, be presented; Howard and Katt agreed. Rich moved the updated proposal be taken forward. Pradeep agreed consider one proposal and to use the updated proposal.

Pradeep takes motion to the table for a vote:

MOTION: To take only one proposal to the membership, Option 2 (Option 2 maintains the four officers for the Executive Committee, with five (5) regionally-selected Regional Representatives from State Directors, plus two (2) At-Large State Directors representatives; one (1) At-Large Associate, State Member Representative; and one (1) Associate Member Representative who must be a

State Associate or Non-State Associate member (not an organizational member representative).

Katt; Howard.

MOTION APPROVED.

Green summarized the plan is to have intentional outreach of State Directors over the spring and Summer, schedule a Board meeting for August, finalize it in the late summer to take to the attorney, and present to the full membership in October for a vote.

Perkins Update: Green welcomed our new Senior Associate for Federal Policy, Kathryn Zekus. Zekus comes to her role with extensive experience in advocacy and implementation, having worked at Achieve most recently.

Green shared that reauthorization activity has begun again. The expectation is that the House will re-introduce a slightly updated version of the bill it passed last session H.R. 5587. Staff discussions are happening in both the House and between the House and Senate, as there is an expectation that the Senate is not planning to develop its own bill but instead to just introduce and pass the House bill. This means that all changes to the legislation must be made during the House's consideration of the bill.

Our top priority is getting the CTE concentrator definition fixed. There are other minor improvements we are seeking but none are as critical.

Right now, Hill staff are working through challenges being raised by a subset of the civil rights organizations related to secretarial authority. This concern is being raised not because of Perkins but because of how ESSA implementation has been handled.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Upcoming meetings:

Quinn reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule:

May 1, 2017 at the Spring Meeting at the Omni Shoreham, Washington D.C., 9 a.m. – 2 ET

June 22, 2017 Conference call, 2-3 p.m. ET, **Topic:** FY18 budget approval