NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

State Board for Career and Technical Education Agenda

February 24, 2025
1:00 PM CT
Microsoft Teams

Microsoft Teams - [Click here to join meeting](#)
Meeting ID: 235 109 326 776 - Passcode: ina6US

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Board Outcome Progress Monitoring - Goal 1 - The percentage of students identified as concentrators (grades 10-12) in Career and Technical Education as measured by the Consolidated Annual Report, will increase from 28.5% January 2024 (2022-2023 school year) to 40% in January 2028 (2026-27 school year).**
   a. **GPM 1.1 – Rural Concentrator**
   b. **GPM 1.2 – Minority Concentrator**
   c. **GPM 1.3 – Special Population Concentrator**
3. **Consent Agenda**
   a. **Approve January 27, 2025 Minutes**
   b. **Accept Finance Reports**
   c. **Accept State Director's Report – Agency Update**
4. **Discussion and Possible Action**
   a. **Revised Program Approval Policy 2nd Reading**
   b. **Revised Secondary CTE Funding Policy 1st Reading**
5. **Information Only**
   a. **January Time Tracking Report**
   b. **Strategic Questioning Strategies**
6. **Board Comments**
7. **Adjourn**

NOTE: The exact time each agenda item will be discussed cannot be assured. Therefore, individuals interested in attending any portion of the meeting should plan their schedules accordingly.

Persons requiring auxiliary aids or services must contact CTE at 701-328-3180 at least three working days prior to the scheduled meeting date.

Responses to Board Question – February 24, 2025

Technical and Tactical Questions

2. Questions related to all GPMs

1) Your presentation shows 35,330 students statewide; the CAR from last month's meeting shows 26,085. Why are these two numbers different?

The 35,330 count includes all North Dakota students, 9-12th grades. The 26,085 is only the CTE participants.

2) Our goal is to identify concentrators in grades 10-12. The data presented is for grades 9-12. Does this data truly reflect our progress measure? It seems unlikely that many ninth graders would achieve concentrator status. Is it possible that if 9th graders are left out that we would meet or at least be closer to our targets?

The reports we receive identifying concentrators comes as 9-12 grade students. It will take time to rebuild that report to answer this question. We originally set up our baselines on 9-12 grade students. If the Board feels we need to amend our progress measures, to align with the data, I support that. If we remain as 10-12, then we may need to set new baselines and new targets.

3) The data states "unduplicated" concentrators. Does this mean that if a student is a concentrator in two CTE programs, they are counted only as one concentrator? Are there many students that become concentrators in multiple programs? If so, and if counted, would that make a significant difference in our data?

Yes, that is correct. The last concentrator achievement is counted, to possibly best align with a student's career path. I am not sure the number of concentrators from multiple programs. We would need to engage with SLDS to answer this question.

4) Our goal states that we use CAR for our measurement tool. What are the sources of data for CAR (SLDS, Powerschool, other?) Are we confident in this data? As Powerschool is replaced by Infinite Campus, do we expect the data to be better?

The sources of the data is STARS. SLDS is only the data warehouse where data is stored and can be compared to other data sources. For example, K12 data, Higher Ed data, Workforce data. It is what is submitted by the local school districts. Infinite Campus may improve data quality.

5) For all these GPMs, I think I could visualize it better if the annual targets are presented on a line graph with a second line portraying the actual outcomes each year.

Yes, I concur, but I believe a trend line needs to be created first to best illustrate this. All we have is a baseline and a 1st year. I recommend we wait until the 2nd year to develop a line chart showing goal and actual.

2.a. GPM 1.1 Rural Concentrators

  1) How are rural students defined?

A rural student is identified as a student that attends a rural school. This excludes the largest school districts, that are located within the State's urban centers.

  2) While it is not part of this goal, do we have data that shows the percentage of urban concentrators? How do we define urban students?

Urban concentrator percentage is 22.1%. 5,090 urban students are considered achieving concentrator status, with 23,028 9-12 grade students attending school in an urban center.

2.b. GPM 1.2 Minority Concentrators

  1) How are minority students distributed in rural vs. urban schools?

This will take time to determine. I will have our data specialist begin this work.

2.c. GPM 1.3 Special Populations Concentrators

  1) Please expand on your comment that many of these areas are self-reported resulting in inconsistent data. Is there a way to improve the data? If the data is flawed, should we be using this as a progress measure? Or should we be finding a better way to measure it?

The identification of these various sub-populations is self-reported by the student and/or guardians. That is the reason why the data isn't 100% clear. There is no way to require a family to identify their student in a specific sub-population. These are federal measures that we are required to report on, although the data may be flawed.

How does the strategy of career centers get operationalized to move the needle on these GPMs? Seems the high level strategy is the centers opening, but the tactical next steps weren't clear.

I understand the responses to the GPMs next steps are very vague, but I am hopeful Board discussion can help the Department with strategies. The Board decided to focus on increasing the concentrator rates of various demographics. I believe some next steps that I could have included are to identify if there are areas where there are concentrations of the various populations listed and work closely with Centers in those areas to focus recruitment efforts. We have seen this happening in our Native American populations, but those locations may be a little easier to identify.

3.b. Second Reading Program Approval Policy

  1) 3.b. *non-certified teacher plan of study* – Is it correct to say that a plan of study is "assigned" by the Department? The previous statement says "…the teacher is placed on…a plan of study." Who actually "places" or "assigns" the permitted or long-term substitute teacher on the plan of study? The school or center by which they are employed? Or the department?

Since the Department either endorses or provides guidance to ESPB for CTE credentials, the Department Program Supervisors assign the plan of study.

2) 8.a. How can we evaluate "accessible?" If a program is "accessible" to a member school, but none of that member school's students enroll in it for one, two, or five years, is it really "accessible?" How does the department evaluate accessibility if there are apparent barriers to enrollment for one or more member schools?

Besides asking the Centers to self report, we do not have a way of assessing accessibility. We are hopeful that the transition to Infinite Campus will identify accessibility or the lack of it. With that data, we can evaluate that and place the expectation on Centers to improve accessibility if enrollment is not there. If it doesn't improve, the Department and the Board would need to take action.

3) 8.e. Staff supervised and evaluated by CTE Center Director.
   a. Is "Center Director" the correct term? Should it say a Certified CTE Administrator (could refer to either a director or assistant director). This is, I assume, as opposed to a CTE teacher being evaluated by a building principal or school superintendent that does not hold a CTE administrator credential.

Yes, it could read Certified CTE Administrator, but we are focusing on those that operate a CTE Center. We also have Certified CTE Administrators at our comprehensive high schools. We are most interested in the authority of that position.

   b. Given that this is highlighted in yellow, I understand this to be a new requirement. What, if any, feedback have we received from the field about this new requirement?

The Department has not received any feedback from the field. There were questions during the Director's meeting, but they were all clarifying questions.

   c. How will the department verify that CTE staff is being supervised and evaluated by CTE administrators? Does this create an onerous burden to either center directors or the department?

Currently with the work Mr. Wagner does with the directors he has a handle on who does staff evaluations. Verification process will have to set up with something as simple of list of employees and dates when evaluation was completed. Short answer is yes, a verification process would be used, but it will not be a large burden.

4) 8.g. Please provide specific reasons why "center-held personnel contracts are encouraged." What reasons do some centers choose not to hold contracts for some or all of their personnel? Do we have evidence that programs for which centers hold contracts are more effective than those that do not?

We believe it may be better because evaluations will be conducted by Directors and this would foster more collaboration, professional development, and curriculum alignment, to name a few benefits. No, we do not have evidence if that is more effective but it would provide more authority to the Center Director. In what Mr. Wagner has observed it has made changes and positive progress in those instructors and programs, no data just an observation.

5) 9.b. Virtual/Hybrid class and lab time distribution – How will the department verify that programs have met these guidelines?

The Department is already requesting calendar of units and master teaching schedules. The lab time information would need to be included in this information.

6) Requirements for a New Administrative Program – We have had discussion regarding funding allocation for administrative positions.
   a. Is it appropriate to refer to an ***"Administrative Program"*** in this policy? Is an administrator really a "program" or would it be more appropriate to refer to it as a "position?"

Yes, possibly. We can rename that as an Administrative Position.

   b. Is it current policy or practice that a center must get department approval in order to hire an additional administrator? Or is that a local board decision and the department is only specifying the required credentials?

No, a Center does not need Department approval to hire an additional administrator. It is a local Board decision. The Department has the authority to credential and approve State funding for the administrator.

   c. Is it necessary to specify in policy that an administrator must be credentialed, or is it already in century code?

No, this is not in Century Code.

1. **Revised Program Approval Policy**

   a. Virtual / Hybrid program criteria: Would these criteria, specifically class time distribution, also apply to face-to-face courses as minimum criteria? If so, would it be worth considering including it as criteria, inclusive of virtual and hybrid programming but not specific to virtual/hybrid programming?

Yes, I would think these minimum criteria would apply, but these expectations are happening in face-to-face offerings. We are able to see this as program supervisors review calendar of units, which are provided by the instructors and complete Vision Visits.

   b. Are the Requirements for a new Administrative Program dependent upon the funding policy? In other words, if the Board elects not to include a line item for Administrator, should it be a part of this program approval policy?

Yes, I believe it is dependent on the funding policy, but also believe the Department should have influence on the credentialing of CTE Administrators.

3.c. First Reading Secondary CTE Funding Policy

Packet page 28, 2. Performance-Based Adjustments – refers to 2.25% of base program allocation… I don't recall this being expressed as a percentage before. Has it changed from a dollar amount? The supplementary document (page 30) refers to $1,000.

How do the $1,000 amounts associated with the quality incentives relate to the 2.25% of the base allocation referenced in the funding policy?

See the response above.

Packet page 28, I don't understand your comment about operating funds by tier. Is it the intent that a fixed percentage of dollars be allocated to these various buckets, or should the percentage remain fluid as we respond to changing conditions?

This was a suggestion from a subcommittee member after the close of the last meeting.

Packet page 28, Performance Based funding is based on meeting concentrator and work-based learning targets. These are not known until the end of the year. When is this funding distributed? Does this create a timing challenge for the department?

The WBL and Concentrator indicators will need to be a lagging indicator. The Department will need to use the prior year's data to determine the performance-based funding. This is finalized in January when the CAR is approved. A supplemental payment can be made after the report is finalized. This is one idea the Department can consider to address payments for Performance Based Funding.

Packet page 29, Funding New Programs – I understand this to mean that for year one of a new program, the program will be funded as if we assume they will meet both of the performance based indicators. In years two and beyond, will the performance-based funding be allocated based on what happened in the previous year? Or the current year? Performance-based indicators are lagging (not know until the end of the year), so are programs to get this funding at the end of the year?

Yes, it would have to be the previous year. See my comment above.

Page 29 – Fiscal Accountability – Because Annual Expenditure Reports are due on September 15, well past the end of the fiscal year, is this feasible? How would the department recover any funds determined to be expended inappropriately? Would they be withheld from the eligible recipients next year allocations?

We would need to withhold funds the following year. The Annual Expenditure Report lists the various areas funds can be used, salary, travel, supplies, equipment. Desk audits would identify misuse, which could impact future payments.

Page 29 – Operating Fund allocation – Members and Programs are known at the beginning of the year. Student enrollment based on course credits earned is not known until the end of the year. When will funds be distributed to centers? Can much of the funding be distributed at the beginning of the fiscal year, with a portion be held back and distributed at the end of the year when completed credits are known?

A snapshot of the enrollment/credits would be identified by October of each year. That number is what the enrollment factor would be based on. Payments to Centers can occur shortly thereafter. The Department can also make payments at the beginning of the year, and hold payments for later in the year, once the data is finalized. Historically, the Centers have received

quarterly payments, with the final payment occurring at the end of the fiscal year, including the balance of the reimbursement.

Page 30 – Proposed Funding Levels

1) What process will the department use to evaluate and propose adjustments to these factors? Certainly overall funding appropriated by the legislature is the overriding consideration. What else? For example, percentage of total funding to be allocated to schools and centers?

First, yes, we need to take Legislative Appropriation into consideration. A secondary consideration could be cost of program. This will evolve as the policy is implemented, not every detail is 100% ironed out.

It is understandable for stakeholders to be fearful of a change in the funding formula, as change is hard. Can you highlight for us the key advantages of the revised formula, what problems have we addressed, how will the revised funding model enhance CTE in North Dakota?

The advantages of this revised policy is it aligns with the six principles, adopted by the subcommittee. This model is a simpler model. It reduces the bureaucracy of submitting and reviewing hundreds, if not thousands of receipts. It allows our Program Supervisors to focus on the quality of the program, instead of auditing expenses. This policy would allow the Department to provide payment to our programs earlier in the year, instead of at the end of the fiscal year. It will help the Department develop a budget and tell a more convincing story to our stakeholders, such as Legislators, what we are providing for the State's investment.

1. Secondary CTE Funding Levels

a. Are the funding levels within the packet the current recommendation for full board discussion or place holders? For example, we have not reached consensus within the sub-committee on including funding for "Administrators" as direct line item.

Yes, these are place holders, but I welcome suggestions from the entire Board. . These were the dollar amounts that were presented during a January subcommittee meeting.

b. It appears as though the amounts in the funding policy could use labels. For example, Are the quality incentives just $1,000 or $1,000 per something else (FTE/concentrator/student, etc)? Is the "Programs Offered" funding per program?

That information is included in the actual funding policy. If it is also stated in the Funding Levels document, it would be duplicative of the policy itself. The intent is for a local recipient to understand the funding policy and refer to the funding level document as that changes.

1. Page 33 of the packet- Goal progress #3
   a. Has there been any progress on the development of a statewide virtual CTE Course catalog? I am not sure if funding was the primary driver of the desire to have this information available.

No, no progress has been made. This work has been set aside as we continue to work on program approval and funding policies. There has been resistance from the field of creating a virtual CTE Course catalog as member schools of a virtual center may look the opportunity to enroll their students in a course, if spots are open to schools that are not members.

Strategic questions.

1) **Strategic:** What strategies might be employed to improve our concentrator numbers in multiple progress measures? For example, if a particular minority is predominantly in rural schools, could improving concentrators in rural schools also result in more concentrators for that minority?

The Department currently has no lever or incentive to improve concentrator numbers, except for access to the Special Populations funds, as required by Perkins V. I believe the example is accurate, if minority students are predominately in rural schools and that rate increases, so should minority concentrators. This is also the rationale of why the Funding Subcommittee has been discussing the performance based adjustments to include dollars for concentrator attainment. It could be a motivation to move that needle.

2) **Strategic:** Is anything happening in predominantly Native American schools that may improve NA concentrators? If so, what is the CTE department doing to support these efforts?

There are several positive things going on in our predominately NA schools. Dunseith has completed a CTE Center, which opened in August 2024. There are conversations occurring in Belcourt, placing more emphasis on CTE in their community. Bakken Area Skills Center has reached out to schools on the Fort Berthold Reservation, looking for ways to serve them. Finally, Heart River Career and Technical Education Center is having conversations with schools on Standing Rock Reservation, to do the same.

3) **Strategic:** Hispanic concentrators increased from 14% to 17.2%, an increase of nearly 23%. What strategies may have contributed to this improvement?

The biggest strategy is the added programs available to those areas with a higher Hispanic population such as Minto, Fargo, Grand Forks and the western centers.

We would need to conduct further analysis to locate where these students reside and determine if any additional work was done to recruit them into CTE programs. This is where local engagement in the Opportunity Gap Analysis could be helpful.

Progress Monitoring

Goal 1

The percentage of students identified as concentrators (grades 10-12) in Career and Technical Education as measured by the Consolidated Annual Report, will increase from 28.5% January 2024 (2022-2023 school year) to 40% in January 2028 (2026-27 school year).

Annual Targets:2024-31%, 2025-33%, 2026-35%, 2027-37%, 2028-40%

Student Outcome Goal Progress Measure 1.1

The Percentage of students in rural schools identified as a concentrator will increase from 40% in 2023 to 50% in 2028 as measured by the Consolidated Annual Report.

Annual Targets:2024-42%, 2025-44%, 2026-46%, 2027-48%, 2028-50%

Director Response

Population	Baseline	2024 Target	2024 Actual
All Students	29%	31%	28%
Rural Students	40%	42%	38%

Director Response

Explanation:

All Students:
9,777 – Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
35,330 – 9-12 Students statewide

4,687 – Rural Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
12,302 – 9-12 Rural Students statewide

Director Response

The state concentrator rates decreased for rural and all students. Although our number of concentrators have grown year over year, the student population has grown at a faster rate.

We did not make our targets.

Next Steps

A next step is to monitor the opening and expansion of CTE Centers, with an emphasis in ensuring Centers are providing access to rural school districts.

Another step is to determine how to incentive concentrator rates.

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Student Outcome Goal Progress Measure 1.2

The percentage of minority students identified as a concentrator will increase from 14% in 2023 to 24% in 2028 as measured by the Consolidated Annual Report.

Annual Targets:2024-16%, 2025-18%, 2026-20%, 2027-22%, 2028-24%

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Director Response

Population	Baseline	2024 Target	2024 Actual
All Minority Students	14%	16%	14.3%
Native American	17%	19%	15.7%
Black	9%	11%	9.2%
Hispanic	14%	16%	17.2%

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education
Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Director Response

All Minority Students:
1,247 – Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
8,696 – 9-12 Students statewide

601 – Native American Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
3,823 – 9-12 Native American Students statewide

224 – Black Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
2,426 – 9-12 Black Students statewide

422 – Hispanic Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
2,447 – 9-12 Hispanic Students statewide

Director Response

The State did not see any consistent increase or decrease in Concentrator students in the Minority Student areas.

We did not make our targets.

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education
Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Next Steps

A next step is to monitor the opening and expansion of CTE Centers, with an emphasis in ensuring Centers are providing access to schools that may serve high populations of minority students.

Another step is to determine how to incentive concentrator rates.

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education
Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Student Outcome Goal Progress Measure 1.3

The percentage of special population students identified as a concentrator will increase from 25% in 2023 to 35% in 2028 as measured by the Consolidated Annual Report.

Annual Targets:2024-27%, 2025-29%, 2026-31%, 2027-33%, 2028-35%

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Director Response

Population	Baseline	2024 Target	2024 Actual
All Special Populations	25%	27%	23.2%
Students w/Disabilities	23%	25%	21.0%
Econ. Disadvantaged	26%	28%	27.3%
English Learners	8%	10%	9.0%
Homeless	16%	18%	11.6%
Youth w/Parent in Military	36%	38%	21.4%

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education
Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Director Response

All Special Population Students:
4,452 – Concentrators statewide
19,205 – 9-12 Students statewide

1,400 – Students with Disabilities - Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
6,662 – 9-12 Students with Disabilities statewide

2,769 – Econ. Disadvantaged Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
10,157 – 9-12 Economically Disadvantage Students statewide

117 – English Learners statewide (unduplicated)
1,305 – 9-12 English Learners Students statewide

77 – Homeless Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
666 – 9-12 Homeless Students statewide

89 – Youth w/ Parent in Military Concentrators statewide (unduplicated)
415 – 9-12 Youth w/Parent in Military statewide

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Director Response

The State saw a consistent decrease in Concentrator students for all Special Population Student areas.

Unfortunately, many of these areas are self reported, therefore that provides for inconsistent data.

We did not make our targets.

Next Steps

An initial step is to review the Special Populations Grant, to determine how it may be better used.

Another next step is to monitor the opening and expansion of CTE Centers, to ensure they are proactively serving the various special populations.

Finally, we need to determine how to incentive concentrator rates.

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

Preparing Tomorrow's Workforce

Minutes for State Board for Career and Technical Education
January 27, 2025

Call to Order:

The regular meeting of the State Board for Career and Technical Education was held on Monday, January 27, 2025, in the CTE Conference Room and via Microsoft Teams. It was called to order by Chair Sonia Meehl at 10:02 am CT.

Roll call was conducted and voting members present include:

> Board Member Levi Bachmeier
> Board Member Pat Bertagnolli
> Board Member Lyndsi Engstrom
> Chancellor Mark Hagerott
> Vice-Chair Mike McHugh
> Board Member Eric Nelson
> Board Member Jason Rohr

Also present: Wayde Sick, Mark Wagner, Gwen Ferderer, Laurie Elliott, Donna Fishbeck, Wayne Heckaman, Pam Stroklund, Daniel Spellerberg, Lyle Krueger, Maggie Backen, Ronda Schauer, Aaron Anderson, Heidi Eckart, Mike Hanson, Denise Jonas, Derrick Bopp, Christa Brodina, Dawn Ulmer and Lorie Ruff.

Meeting chat information for this meeting does not exist.

Board Outcome Progress Monitoring:

Wayde Sick presented the Director Guardrail Progress Measure 1.1 Monitoring Report. This measure ensures that the Board will receive quality program reports utilizing the Opportunity Gap Analysis. The data used is generated by the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and the 2022-23 data revealed minimal disparities at the state level. The 2023-24 data will be available to analyze in February 2025. Two areas the agency will be focusing on is Education and Training and Law & Public Safety as the 2022-23 data revealed relatively low to no programs in those areas.

Wayde then reviewed the Director Guardrail Progress Measure 3.3 – Public/Private Partnerships. To date the agency has generated a total of 779 partnerships with our goal being 910. To continue to meet this goal, we need to concentrate on the Educator level to ensure there is a statewide adoption of the Compass platform and access to a Work-Based Learning Coordinator. Our agency is encouraging every CTE instructor in ND and providing professional development to educate them.

Mike McHugh moved to accept the Director's Progress Monitoring Reports as presented and it was seconded by Lyndsi Engstrom. The motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda:

Lyndsi Engstrom moved to approve and accept the items listed on the consent agenda and it was seconded by Levi Bachmeier. The motion passed unanimously.

Information Only:

Funding Policy Sub-Committee Update and December Time Tracking Report: Chair Meehl referenced the documents in the material packet indicating that they are for information only and no action is to be taken. She noted that the funding subcommittee will be meeting again tomorrow afternoon.

Board Comments:

Chair Meehl informed members that Pat Bertagnolli was reappointed Executive Director of Job Service North Dakota and will continue to serve on this Board. Pat Bertagnolli stated how he enjoys supporting CTE and judging at the different events for our student organizations.

Chair Meehl thanked members for reviewing the material packet and submitting questions. She also reported that the shared drive that houses our documents will be ready soon.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 24.

There being no other business brought before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 10:58 am.

_____
Sonia Meehl
SBCTE Chairperson

DEPARTMENT OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
APPROPRIATION STATUS REPORT
FOR THE MONTH ENDED JANUARY 31, 2025

	ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	CURRENT APPROPRIATION	BIENNIUM TO DATE EXPENSE	%	BALANCE OF APPROPRIATION
EXPENDITURES BY LINE ITEM					
SALARIES AND WAGES	$4,984,211.00	$5,406,928.00	$3,796,946.61	70%	$1,609,981.39
OPERATING EXPENSES	$3,046,350.00	$3,046,350.00	$1,940,113.15	64%	$1,106,236.85
GRANTS	$12,007,349.00	$12,007,349.00	$5,432,006.09	45%	$6,575,342.91
GRANTS - SECONDARY	$41,537,780.00	$41,537,780.00	$29,590,713.63	71%	$11,947,066.37
GRANTS - STEM	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$40,435.58	40%	$59,564.42
CRF-INITIATIVE GRANT PROGRAM	$97,276,228.00	$157,167,541.85	$84,529,893.94	54%	$72,637,647.91
ADULT FARM MANAGEMENT	$1,706,138.00	$1,706,138.00	$484,121.01	28%	$1,222,016.99
WORKFORCE TRAINING	$2,987,500.00	$2,986,419.68	$2,495,966.68	84%	$490,453.00
MARKETPLACE FOR KIDS	$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$238,364.08	79%	$61,635.92
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$163,945,556.00	$224,258,506.53	$128,548,560.77	57%	$95,709,945.76
EXPENDITURES BY SOURCE					
GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	$53,200,708.00	$53,532,351.34	$36,445,903.89	68%	$17,086,447.45
FEDERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	$110,589,874.00	$143,558,681.19	$69,198,223.55	48%	$74,360,457.64
SPECIAL FUND EXPENDITURES	$154,974.00	$27,167,474.00	$20,194,011.70	74%	$6,973,462.30
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$163,945,556.00	$224,258,506.53	$125,838,139.14	56%	$98,420,367.39

DEPARTMENT OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

CTE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

2023 - 2025 Biennium

Jan-25	23 - 25 BUDGET	CURRENT MONTH EXPENDITURES	YEAR TO DATE EXPENDITURES	BALANCE OF BUDGET	PERCENT OF BUDGET EXPENDED	PERCENT OF TIME ELAPSED
SALARIES	$5,406,928.00	$213,406.80	$3,796,946.61	$1,609,981.39	70.22%	79.17%
OPERATING EXPENSES	$3,046,350.00	$301,541.03	$1,940,113.15	$1,106,236.85	63.69%	79.17%
TRAVEL	$380,000.00	$18,051.82	$247,167.58	$132,832.42	65.04%	79.17%
DUES & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	$400,000.00	$5,066.35	$90,160.17	$309,839.83	22.54%	79.17%
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	$361,350.00	$5,964.00	$46,583.46	$314,766.54	12.89%	79.17%
RENT/LEASES/UTILITIES/REPAIRS	$210,000.00	$0.00	$163,288.88	$46,711.12	77.76%	79.17%
POSTAGE	$25,000.00	$126.24	$3,466.05	$21,533.95	13.86%	79.17%
OPERATING FEES	$75,000.00	$70.00	$26,161.05	$48,838.95	34.88%	79.17%
SUPPLIES	$1,200,000.00	$264,679.48	$1,194,148.11	$5,851.89	99.51%	79.17%
PRINTING & PAPER	$100,000.00	$545.71	$27,392.77	$72,607.23	27.39%	79.17%
TELEPHONE	$20,000.00	$685.73	$11,725.58	$8,274.42	58.63%	79.17%
ITD	$200,000.00	$6,351.70	$127,234.02	$72,765.98	63.62%	79.17%
FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT	$75,000.00	$0.00	$2,785.48	$72,214.52	3.71%	79.17%
TOTAL	$8,453,278.00	$514,947.83	$5,737,059.76	$2,716,218.24	67.87%	79.17%

CAR Reporting & Mapping	$	5,964.00
RUReady	$	263,964.00

CTE State Director's Report
January 2025

Goal Progress

1) Develop an equitable and effective Career and Technical Education funding model that would incentivize access to quality Career and Technical Education programs.

A draft policy continues to be worked on by the Board Funding Subcommittee.

2) Review and edit the Department's Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan. Procure an outside organization as needed.

This work continues, under the guidance of Elliot and McMahon. October's training session was the conclusion of the formal training from E&M. The remainder of the assistance from E&M will include coaching for the Director and the various subcommittees.

3) Develop a common virtual Career and Technical Education course catalog. This would include the review of course alignment with standards and explore the option of adding virtual CTE course codes. How a theory course aligns with the coordinated plans of study and scholarship eligibility will need to be studied as well.

This continues to be a discussion with the Funding subcommittee, to determine how to best fund and deliver virtual career and technical education statewide.

General Updates

Executive Officer for State Board for CTE

The Department has learned on 2/10/24 the US Department of Education has announced plans to rescind the updated State Plan and CAR Guides Information Collection Requests. This will result in no changes to either the State Plan Guide or CAR Guide.

The Department has interviewed candidates for the Program Specialist vacancy and has extended an offer. The formal announcement is pending the background check.

Interpret and Implement Board Policy and State and Federal Law

The Department has provided a refresher presentation to the CTE Directors on the Opportunity Gap Analysis on February 4th. This was to spur an interest in local programs to conduct an OGA. We continue to work with SLDS to determine how to automate this process and provide the analysis to whatever level is desired. For example, school district, county, center membership.

Planning and Coordination

The local CTE Directors met in Bismarck on February 3rd and 4th. The agenda included Funding Policy, Program Approval Policy, Legislative Agenda and update and opportunities to engage in CTE in Memorial Hall and State Legislators.

Fiscal Management

The Department is on pace to finish the biennium within budget.

Advocate for Career and Technical Education

The bulk of the effort as an advocate for CTE, has been specific the Legislative work.

Legislative Update

The Department is currently tracking 147 bills, with various levels of engagement. I am not including any Department Appropriations bills, as we are tracking a number of those as well.

Below are the bills the Department are most interested in:

HB1036 – This bill would create an office of apprenticeship within the ND Dept. of Labor that would support the ND Federal Office of Apprenticeship. This has been passed out of House IBL on 2/10 but did not include amendments we hope for. We will work on amendments on the Senate side.

HB1037 – This bill would appropriate $750,000 to NDCTE to grant funds to a workforce center serving NW ND for UAS training. Has been referred to appropriations.

HB1098 – This bill would allow for students taking the General Education teacher pathway to be eligible for the State Scholarship. This has passed through the House and sent to the Senate.

HB1126 – This bill would allow students, the age of 16, to be trained as cosmetologists. It would require them to be in a registered apprenticeship program to do so. This bill was missed on the first half of the session, but we will track as it moves through the Senate. It has passed the House and will now move to the Senate after crossover.

HB1188 – This bill would provide flexibility to local CTE Center Boards, on how they assess their member schools. This has passed the House and will now move to the Senate.

HB1214 – This bill, among other things, codifies that transportation will be reimbursed by DPI to CTE Centers and other school districts, to enroll in CTE Courses. This is to be included in the per pupil payment. This has passed House Education and has been rereferred to Appropriations.

HB1249 – Duplicate bill of HB1037. This has passed through the House IBL committee and has been rereferred to Appropriations.

HB1251 – Prohibits schools from holding an extracurricular activity on family days, to include Easter Sunday. This is important to NDCTE as in the past, State CTSO events started the evening of Easter Sunday. If passed, we will need to ensure this doesn't happen again. This bill failed in the House.

HB1404 – This bill adds a military pathway as an avenue of earning the State Scholarship. This has passed the House and has been sent to the Senate.

HB1498 – This bill would allow a local school board the ability provide sign on bonuses to new teachers. The Department was able to amend this bill to also give a Center Board the same ability. It has passed the House.

SB2009 – North Dakota State Fair appropriation bill. The NDCTE Agricultural Education Office organized FFA State Officers to present on behalf of the NDSF. This has passed the Senate, adding funds for infrastructure improvements.

SB2019 – ND CTE Appropriations bill. This has moved out of Senate Appropriations E&E amended as follows:

- Adding dollars back in for salaries, specific to the FTE Funding and Vacancy Pool. Employee pay increases will not be determined until later in the Session. There are multiple scenarios floating around.
- Accept the $4M Cost to Continue request
- Include $3M for New and Expanding. The initial request was $22M
- Accept the $2.5M in Perkins spending authority
- Include $100,000 for Market Place for Kids. The initial request was $150,000
- Include $750,000 for TrainND. The initial request was $1.6M
- Include $1,000,000 for Virtual Reality Career Exploration. The initial request was $2,000,000
- Increases not included are as follows:
  - STEM Network - $250,000
  - CTE Educator Recruitment - $650,000

- o Apprenticeship FTEs - $600,000
- o WBL Coordinator Grants - $1.5M
- o Capital Projects - $56M

SB2105 – This bill places significant guardrails on schools on surveying students. The bill states the only 3rd party allowed to survey students is NDDPI. NDCTE and its CTSOs distribute surveys, to collect information. Although I have visited with the bill sponsor, and he has indicated this shouldn't impact us, I am still concerned and will engage as needed. No action has been taken except its initial hearing on 1/21.

SB2131 – A bill that would codify the TrainND funding policy, that the State CTE Board approved in December 2024. A follow up hearing was held on 2/13.

SB2147 – This bill makes amendments to a number of state scholarships, including the State Scholarship and Career Builders. This has passed Senate Education and has been rereferred to Appropriations.

SB2234 – This bill creates and funds the Choice Ready grant through DPI. This has passed the Senate and now moves on to the House.

SB2239 – This bill creates an Apprenticeship Grant, to provide funds to new apprentices, to offset costs. This has passed the Senate Workforce Committee and was rereferred to Appropriations.

SB2274 – This bill moves the Farm Management Education Program from NDCTE to the Department of Agriculture. This has passed through Senate Agriculture and the Senate Appropriations E&E division. It will now be heard by the full Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB2308 – This is a bill that will study the multiple Boards and Commissions and dissolve others. This would dissolve the SLDS Committee, and an amendment was introduced to place the authority of SLDS under the NDIT, which I feel is appropriate. The only action is the initial hearing.

The Legislative Calendar for the remainder of the session is listed below:

February 25th – Bills must be out of committee in the house of origin.

February 28th – Crossover

March 5th – Reconvene from Crossover Break

March 28th – Deadline for rereferrals of bills in second house to Appropriations Committees

April 9th – Bills and resolutions must be reported out of committee in second house

May 2nd – 80th Day

North Dakota FBLA

TO: Members of the State Board for Career and Technical Education

FROM: Jessica DeVaal, FBLA State Chair

DATE: January 2025

RE: FBLA State Conferences

North Dakota Future Business Leaders of America will be holding their state conferences in March and April. The FBLA High School & Middle School State Leadership Conference will be held at the Bismarck Event Center on March 30 – April 1 and the FBLA Collegiate State Leadership Conference will be held at the Baymont Inn in Mandan on March 23-24. We would like to invite you to be our guest at these conferences.

The FBLA Collegiate conference will begin on Sunday, March 23, with the competitive events program and leadership activities to follow. The Awards of Excellence Program will be held on Monday, March 24. We will also be joined by FBLA Collegiate chapters from South Dakota attending the conference.

The opening general session of the FBLA High School & Middle School conference will start at 8 p.m., Sunday, March 30. There are numerous events planned for Monday, including our competitive events program. We would especially like to invite you to our Awards of Excellence Program on Tuesday, April 1, beginning at 9 a.m.

Approximately 1,4000 middle school, high school and college students from throughout North Dakota will be involved in these conferences. They will be participating in numerous leadership activities, workshops, and competitive events throughout the conferences. Our members have worked hard throughout the year in preparation for this event, and in the process they have grown as leaders in their schools and communities. If possible, you may wish to take the opportunity to visit any or all of these activities.

For our planning purposes, please let Lorie Ruff or Jessica DeVaal know if you plan to attend.

February 10, 2025

DECA is excited to host its annual State Career Development Conference in Bismarck, March 2-4, 2025, at the Radisson Hotel and Belle Mehus Auditorium.

We are thrilled to celebrate the 72nd year of this event and warmly invite you to join us for all conference activities.

Conference Highlights:

Sunday, March 2

6:30 pm	Opening Session Featuring Calli Thorne (Belle Mehus Auditorium)
8:00 pm	Networking Session (Radisson Hotel)
9:15 pm	Recognition Session & Officer Candidate Speeches (Belle Mehus Auditorium)

Monday, March 3

8:00 am - 4:00 pm	Competition; 51 competitive events for students (Radisson Hotel)
7:00 pm	Quiz Bowl Final (Belle Mehus Auditorium)

Tuesday, March 4

9:30 am	Awards Session (Belle Mehus Auditorium)

Over 500 students from across North Dakota will participate in leadership sessions, marketing challenges, and competitive activities. We encourage you to attend and experience the enthusiasm and talent of these future leaders.

To assist with planning, please email Lila at **lbrendel@nd.gov** by **February 24, 2025**, to confirm your attendance to any of the above sessions.

We look forward to seeing you there!

Sincerely,

Dustin Norby
State Advisor, North Dakota DECA

DECA prepares emerging leaders and entrepreneurs in marketing, finance, hospitality and management.

Approved Program Policy Revision

February 24, 2025

The Department is requesting the Board to approve revisions to the Secondary Program Approval Process. The proposed changes are discussions that have occurred among department staff and the funding subcommittee. This memo serves to explain the changes. The highlighted areas are added amendments.

CTE Certified Teacher – This language gives the Department direction how to handle situations when a program is taught by a permitted or long-term substitute teacher.

Additional Requirements for CTE Center Programs – This language provides guidelines CTE Center Programs are to follow.

Virtual/Hybrid Programs – This section provides expectations for virtual and hybrid programs, to ensure programs are meeting quality standards.

Requirements for a New Administrative Program – The additional language provides authority in policy to approve a CTE Administration program.

The final amendment adds an additional requirement to approved Career Development programs.

With these additional guidelines, the Department will have the ability to direct programs to higher quality. It is my recommendation the Board approves these amendments, effective the 2025-2026 school year.

NORTH DAKOTA
Career and Technical Education

600 East Boulevard Ave – 15th Floor
Bismarck ND 58505
701-328-3180   www.cte.nd.gov

Approved Program Policy
(including new programs, expansions, and transfers)

Requirements for an Approved Instructional Program:

1. Credits
   a. A minimum of 2 credits per year in a coordinated plan.
   b. Distance courses **MAY** be counted as part of the 2-credit sequence for program approval purposes.
2. Class Size (9-12 enrollment)
   a. Class size requirements listed in Perkins V: Size, Scope, Quality Definitions - Secondary programs
3. CTE certified teacher
   a. Refer to teacher licensing requirements for specific program areas
   b. A program utilizing a permitted or long-term substitute teacher will be approved for one year. At the beginning of the following year, the approval will be denied unless a fully certified teacher is hired or the teacher is placed on and is making satisfactory progress on a plan of study, as assigned by the Department. Progress on the plan of study will be monitored annually to ensure satisfactory progress.
4. Curriculum
   a. Based on state, national, or industry standards for each program area.
5. Student Leadership Opportunity
   a. Program related Career & Technical Student Organization (CTSO) OR documented leadership opportunities.
6. Facilities and equipment
   a. Adequate as determined by program standards.
   b. Barrier-free facility.
7. Advisory Committee
   a. Active advisory committee for each instructional program that meets at least two times per school year.
      i. Committee may be combined to serve multiple CTE programs with a minimum of three representatives for each CTE program – unless program standards require a separate committee to serve a specific program.
   b. Refer to the Advisory Committee Guide for details on the requirements and purpose of an advisory committee.

8. Additional requirements for CTE Center Programs:
    a. Programs must be accessible to all member schools,
    b. If the sites serve a single school district, all program alike instructors must meet to collaborate a minimum of four times a year,
    c. If the site serves a single school district, Course Outlines reflect the common programming across all sites,
    d. If the site serves a single school district, the school district must be a member of the center,
    e. Staff must be supervised and evaluated by a certified CTE Center Director,
    f. One advisory committee with representatives from all member schools along with business and industry must be held annually, and
    g. Center-held personnel contracts encouraged, or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with responsibilities and expectations clearly identified.
9. Virtual/Hybrid Programs
    a. Virtual programs must provide opportunities to learn, provide, and practice desired skills in a hands-on manner, as necessary. Hands-on options include but are not limited to the following:
        i. Lab time at the home school
        ii. Attending in-person sessions at a CTE Center or post-secondary institution.
        iii. Employer-provided work-based learning
        iv. Or other eligible training provider
    b. Class Time Distribution: The class time can be divided into two main components:
        i. Lab Time (Hands-on Practice): Typically, lab time for CTE courses should constitute around 50-70% of the total course time, depending on the subject matter and level.
        ii. Lecture/Theory Time: The remaining time should be allocated to theoretical instruction, demonstrations, and assessments.
        iii. Suggested hands-on opportunities breakdown of a semester course (based on 90 hours)
            1. Basic Courses (Introductory Level)
                a. Lab Time: 45 hours (50%)
                b. Lecture/Theory Time: 45 hours (50%)
                c. Example Subjects: Basic automotive repair, introductory welding, culinary arts fundamentals, basic computer programming.
            2. Intermediate Courses
                a. Lab Time: 54 hours (60%)
                b. Lecture/Theory Time: 36 hours (40%)
                c. Example Subjects: Intermediate electronics, advanced culinary arts, health sciences (CNA training), graphic design.
            3. Advanced Courses
                a. Lab Time: 63 hours (70%)
                b. Lecture/Theory Time: 27 hours (30%)
                c. Example Subjects: Advanced welding techniques, robotics, software development, automotive diagnostics.

Requirements for a New Administrative Program

- The administrator must possess a CTE Administrators Credential issued by the Department or making progress on a plan of study to attain a CTE Administrators Credential as assigned by the Department.

Requirements for a New Program

- New Program – Complete the new and expanding program application.

Requirements for a Program Expansion or Transfer

- Program Expansion (any increase in percentage of time from the previous year) – Complete the new and expanding program application.
- Program Transfer – Complete the new and expanding program application.

Requirements for an Approved Career Development Program

1. CTE credentialed counselor (see requirements on page 8 for Career Development in CTE teacher licensing requirements)
2. Program of Work that incorporates ND Career Development Standards including but not limited to the following:
   a. Developing career portfolios (RUReady.ND.gov usage preferred), which include test and grades results, examples of student work, and resumes and cover letters to prospective employers.
   b. Advising students and parents on high school CTE programs and academic curriculum, preparing them for college application and admission.
   c. Arranging job shadowing, work placements, and community-based learning programs to allow students to directly experience workplace situations.
   d. Sponsoring workshops, classes, focus groups, and special presentations that focus on job skills and personal development.
   e. Informing students about postsecondary financing that can be used to support advanced education and training.
   f. Arranging dual/concurrent enrollment and Advanced Placement credits to prepare students for the rigor of postsecondary education.
   g. Planning and preparation for tests related to career development (ACT, SAT, PSAT, ASVAB, WorkKeys).
   h. Providing specialized counseling and intervention services to provide students with individualized attention.
3. Advisory Committee (see above)
4. Minimum of eight class meetings/year in grades seven through twelve.
5. Adequate facilities and equipment as determined by program standards.
6. Additional requirements for CTE Center Career Development Programs:
   a. All center career development counselors meet to collaborate at least four times a year,
   b. Program of Work reflects the common programming across all sites,
   c. Staff must be supervised and evaluated by a certified CTE Center Director,
   d. One advisory committee with representatives from all program schools along with business and industry must be held annually, and
   e. Center-held contracts encouraged, or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with responsibilities and expectations clearly identified.
7. Federal Perkins monies will not be used for Career Development salaries.
8. Federal Perkins monies may be used for equipment in approved programs.

9. Supporting Policy Guidelines

10. Programs may be approved but not funded due to availability of funds.
11. If a deficiency occurs after a program has been approved, there is a one-year grace period to allow a school or institution to correct the deficiency.

Policy update requested: February 2025

~~Policy approved: November 19, 2018~~

Career and Technical Education

Funding Policy

Amended March 24, 2025

ND State Board For Career and Technical Education
Board Members

Ms. Sonia Meehl ....Oakes, Chair
Mr. Mike McHugh ....Mandan, Vice Chair
Mr. Levi Bachmeier……………………………………………………….West Fargo
Ms. Kirsten Baesler ....Bismarck
Mr. Pat Bertagnolli..Bismarck
Ms. Lyndsi Engstrom ....Westhope
Dr. Mark Hagerott...Bismarck
Mr. Eric Nelson..Williston
Mr. Jason Rohr…………………………………………………………………… Jamestown

Wayde Sick, State Director & Executive Officer
600 E Boulevard Ave - Dept 270
Bismarck ND 58505-0610
Phone: (701) 328-3180
E-mail: cte@nd.gov   Website: cte.nd.gov

The Career and Technical Education (CTE) Program Funding Policy was developed to address several State Board for Career and Technical Education (Board) priorities.

The funding policy therefore aligns with the following six priorities:

1) Ensures equitable access,

2) Ensures quality,

3) Incentivizes high quality,

4) Is easy for stakeholders to understand,

5) Lessens the time burden on Department of Career and Technical Education (Department) Staff and local recipients, and

6) Focuses on outputs instead of inputs.

The policy consists of funding based on a flat funding amount, dependent upon the format of the program, and will be calculated on FTE count.

Programs may also receive performance-based funding adjustments based on quality indicators.

Minimum Requirements

CTE Centers	Need to provide a minimum of three occupational CTE programs of CTE with attendance by three or more participating school districts. To receive funding, a CTE Center must have a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) approved by the Board. The Governing Board, indicated in the JPA, will assume governance responsibility and hire a CTE Director certified by the Department.
High School	Must offer at least one CTE career and technical education program to receive funding.

Department Program Supervisors must ensure programs meet the definition of size, scope, and quality as defined in the Perkins V State Plan and Vision Visit results.

Department Program Supervisors will notify the Fiscal Department which programs are eligible for funding.

High Schools and CTE Centers will not be funded for programs that cease to be provided or if a Program Supervisor determines the CTE program to be ineligible. Any program that has a gap in offering or approval (ex. offered in 2021-22 but not in 2022-23) must apply as a reinstated program to be eligible for funding.

Transferring, New, Expanding, and Reinstated Program Definitions

Transferring	Approved CTE program(s) transferring from a High School or an existing or dissolving CTE Center to a CTE Center.
New	CTE program(s) not previously offered within the past five years by a High School or CTE Center.
Expanding	A CTE program that is increasing access through additional courses offerings, course sections, and/or staffing.
Reinstated	A CTE program that had a gap in offering or approval for more than one year.

~~Base level funding~~

Each year, the total amount of funding allocated to each eligible recipient ~~District/Center~~ will be determined by the following components:

1. **Base Allocation:** Each ~~District/Center~~ eligible recipient will receive a base funding allocation based on the FTE of the program. A preliminary estimate will be shared by XX DATE, with a final allocation being communicated by YY DATE.

2. **Performance-Based Adjustments**: ~~Districts/Centers~~ Eligible recipients may be eligible to receive performance-based funding, at 2.25% of the base program allocation, adjustments based on FTE for:
   a. Meeting the annual concentrator target set by the Board. The definition of a secondary CTE Concentrator is a student that has completed at least two credits in a coordinated plan of study.

   b. Meeting the work-based learning target set by the Board. The work-based learning experience must meet guidelines as defined in the work-based learning guidance. WBL Guidance

The funding allocation provided is designated for use within CTE programs. Eligible recipients have the flexibility to apply these funds as needed to support and enhance CTE offerings, whether it be for equipment, resources, curriculum development, or other initiatives that align with program goals and needs.

Achieving these criteria demonstrates ~~the recipient's~~ commitment to student success and workforce readiness, which are key factors in securing additional funding to support educational programs.

Career and Technical Center Operating Funds

To receive CTE Center ~~Administration/~~Operating funds, the administrator must possess a CTE Administrator's Credential issued by the Department.

CTE Centers will receive funding to ~~support~~ supplement local ~~administration/~~operating costs based on the following access factors:

1) **Member Schools**: A center will receive funding based on the number of member school districts served by the CTE Center. A brick-and-mortar CTE Center will receive a fixed

amount for every member school ==district==, while a virtual CTE Center will receive a different-fixed amount for every member school ==district==. The difference in funding is due to the higher costs associated with operating a brick-and-mortar center vs. a virtual center. ~~A member is defined as each School District.~~

2) **Programs offered:** A center will receive funding based on the number of programs delivered in correlation to total programs offered at all state CTE Centers combined.

3) ==**Student Enrollment:** A center will receive funding based on all CTE Center student enrollment. An enrollment is based on course credits.==

Any new or expanding programs will be drawn from Legislatively appropriated new and expanding funds. New and expanding programs will receive funding as specifically appropriated by the legislative body to ensure stable funding.

==All funding levels will be reviewed annually and may be adjusted, based on available funds. Eligible recipients will be notified in a timely manner for proper planning and budgeting for the upcoming year. New allocations will take effect July 1 of each year.==

==In legislative years, when allocations are not immediately available due to pending legislative decisions, eligible recipients should proceed with using the previous year's allocation amount until updated amounts are finalized and communicated.==

Funding for New, Transferring, and Reinstated Programs

Funding New Programs: A new program will receive the base funding amount ~~and~~ along with all performance-based factors in year one. In the second year, funding will be adjusted based on performance-based targets.

Funding Transferring Programs: A transferring program will receive the base funding amount and performance-based adjustments based on the program's recent year's performance data for the first year of the transfer. In the second year, funding will be adjusted based on   performance-based targets.

Funding Reinstating Programs: A reinstated program will receive the base funding amount and performance-based adjustments from the last year the program was in operation if data is available. In the second year, funding will be adjusted based on performance-based targets.

Fiscal Accountability Requirements

~~High Schools and CTE Centers~~ ==Eligible recipients== shall report to the Fiscal Department by September 15th how the funds were used. This will be completed utilizing the Annual Expenditure Report. A desk audit of 10% of all programs and recipients will be conducted annually. Negative findings in the desk audit may negatively impact funding. If ~~a High School or CTE Center~~ ==an eligible recipient== fails to submit the Annual Expenditure Report, it will be ineligible for funding in the following year.

Allocations for existing, transferring, new, expanding, and reinstated CTE programs is dependent upon the availability of sufficient funds.

Secondary Career and Technical Education Funding Levels

All funding levels will be reviewed annually and may be adjusted, based on available funds. Eligible recipients will be notified in a timely manner for proper planning and budgeting for the upcoming year.

In legislative years, when allocations are not immediately available due to pending legislative decisions, eligible recipients should proceed with using the previous year's allocation amount until updated amounts are finalized and communicated.

Below is the base funding, performance-based adjustments and CTE Center operating funds levels for the 2025-2026 school year.

Base Funding

    Comprehensive High School

        Program - $15,500

        Administrator - $30,000

    Career and Technical Education Center

        Program - $44,250

        Administrator - $68,000

Quality Incentives

    WBL - $1,000

    Concentrator - $1,000

Career and Technical Education Access Factors

    Student Enrollment - $62

    Programs Offered - $6,800

    Member School Districts

        Brick and Mortar - $10,000

        Virtual - $3,500

TIME USE TRACKER	North Dakota State CTE Board		QTR:	3	Date: January 2025

Framework Pillars	Student Outcome Minutes	Adult Behavior Minutes	The board tracks its time spent during public authorized meetings	Other Topic Minutes
1. Adopting Student Outcome Goals 2. Adopting Student Outcome Goals 3. Adopted Guardrails		✕	← Minutes setting and adopting both student outcome goals and goal progress measures.	
	✕		← Minutes setting and adopting superintendent and board guardrails, and a theory of action	
4. Adopted Monitoring Calendar for Student Outcome Goals and Superintendent/ Board Guardrails, and Board Self-Evaluation		✕	← Minutes receiving, discussing, and voting on Student Outcome Goal Monitoring Reports according to the board adopted Monitoring Calendar	
	✕	52	← Minutes receiving, discussing, and voting on Guardrail Monitoring Reports according to the board adopted Monitoring Calendar	
	✕		← Minutes performing board self-evaluations using the Be Legendary School Board Leadership Framework Instrument, developing and creating Superintendent evaluation, community engagement, and/or Board Guidelines according to Be Legendary practices.	
5. Structuring for Success	Minutes discussing and/or taking action other agenda items (including consent agenda items and reports) Non-Be Legendary Committee meetings, Board Workshops, and/or non-statue Board Hearings →			49
6. Active Teamwork and Advocacy		✕	← Minutes hosting two-way communication meetings on student outcome goals, guardrails, theories of action and/or progress toward student outcome goals ← Minutes recognizing the accomplishments of students and staff regarding progress on student outcome goals	
Non-calculated time	Minutes fulfilling statutorily required public hearings, forums, and comments → Board Manager Evalution			
TOTALS	52		101	49

Use For Student Outcome and Adult Behavior Minutes Percentage Calculation:

52	÷	101	× 100 =	51.49	% Student Outcome and Adult Behavior Minutes **High percentage of time focused on adult behavior change.**

Use For Student Outcome Minutes Percentage Calculation 3. Monitoring Student Outcome Goals and Goal Progress Measures

0	÷	101	× 100 =	0.00	% Student Outcome Minutes----**No goals were presented. Focus was guardrails.**

Board Members Present- 6. Active Teamwork and Advocacy	Board Absent	% Attendance	Count of 'Other' Agenda Items	Goals Discussed Monitoring Student Outcome Goals	Goals on Target	% on Target
9	0	100.00	3	0		#DIV/0!

Consent Items 4. Operations for Success	Consent Items Removed	% Remaining on Consent Agenda		GPMs Discussed 3. Monitoring Goals Progress Measures	GPMs on Target	% on Target
5	0	100.00		0		#DIV/0!

Board Monitoring for Board Goals and Director Guardrails

The North Dakota CTE Board does an excellent job of monitoring its Student Outcome Goals and Director Guardrails. Since many of you send in questions on the monitoring report along with questions on other agenda items, we thought it would be helpful for you to have the information on questioning close at hand. In questioning the monitoring report, we would also ask that you identify for Wayde questions you consider strategic. Those questions will be answered during the presentation of the monitoring report at the meeting. All other technical or tactical questions will be answered in his written response to the board. So, please send Wayde your questions just identify those questions which are strategic. It would be helpful.

Please review the following information on technical, tactical and strategical questioning.

Thank you.

Technical vs Tactical vs Strategic
Tips for Effective Monitoring Question Development

If the goal being monitored is, "The percentage of our economically disadvantaged graduates who have demonstrated career/college-level proficiency in collaboration skills and problem solving skills on the soft skills portfolio assessment will increase from 27% in August 2020 to 84% by August 2025", here are examples:

Technical (trying to understand how something is measured)
- What's the alignment of the portfolio assessment with the SAT or ACT?
- How do we know the validity of the portfolio assessment?
- What are the psychometric properties of the portfolio assessment?
- Why did we single out collaboration and problem solving skills from all the skills assessed?

Tactical (trying to understand how something is done)
- To whom is the assessment administered?
- Which staff have been trained to administer the assessment?
- What type of PD have staff received regarding the assessment?
- How do staff feel about the assessment?

Strategic (trying to understand how something aligns to the priorities)
- Looking at the data in table 1, which strategy was most effective with our target student population?
- What is a strategy we deployed that didn't work, given the data in table 2, and what did we learn?
- Based on the data in graph 1, why are we seeing such significant growth among our non-target student population but not our target student population?
- Why is the data in graph 2 showing that system performance on item a is so much higher than item b?

Focus & Timing
Technical questions focus on understanding the details surrounding the assessment and goal details themselves. Tactical questions focus on understanding the details surrounding implementation of the assessment and goal. Strategic questions focus on understanding, relative to the goal, what we've learned about system performance and what lessons we've learned from that performance. No questions during an effective monitoring conversation are focused on providing advice to the superintendent, board member opinions about system performance, or efforts to project manage the school system.

Technical and tactical questions are often essential to having a full understanding of current system performance; there is nothing wrong with board members asking technical and tactical questions. Timing matters, however. The superintendent is expected to be the strategic leader over the school system's operations. During a monitoring conversation with the superintendent, it is unreasonable to expect them to also have a mastery of every technical or tactical detail. So if school board members want answers to those questions to be part of the monitoring conversation, they need to ask the questions at least five to seven days in advance of the monitoring session. If that hasn't happened, board members are welcome to still ask new technical and tactical questions during the monitoring session, but the board chair and/or superintendent should advise them that the answers will go out in the next update from the superintendent to the board.

Past vs Future
Regardless of whether or not a question is technical, tactical, or strategic in focus, they can just as easily focus on past actions -- what have our strategies been and what have been the impacts on performance -- as on future actions -- what strategies will we deploy given what our performance currently shows. Boards that are monitoring effectively will invest the majority of their time -- preferably upwards of ¾ of the monitoring session -- focused on understanding the past: where are we, how did we get here, what worked, what didn't work, what did we learn? Only once a board is fully conversant in and knowledgeable of what has happened can it meaningfully engage in future-focused dialogue.

Ineffective boards succumb to the temptation of mostly focusing on technical/tactical, their opinions and statements, or what will happen next. These are weaknesses of discipline and vision and should be corrected.

Questions for Goal monitoring Spreadsheet

When we question, we must evaluate our question by the following:

- Is the question about strategic issues rather than technical or tactical issues?
- Does the question reference specific metrics/data that is in the monitoring report?
- Is the question open ended rather than a yes/no/multiple choice question?
- Does the question focus on under-standing data rather than sharing opinions?
- Does the question focus on past actions/performance rather than future actions?

Technical Questions:

- Try to understand how something is measured
- Focus on understanding details around assessment and goals

Tactical Questions:

- Try to understand how something is done.
- Focus on understanding details around implementation of the assessment and goal.

Strategic Questions:

- Try to understand how something aligns to the priorities.
- Focus on understanding, relative to the goal, what we've learned about system performance and what we've learned from that performance.