Joint Advance CTE/The Center to Advance CTE Board of Directors’ Meeting

MINUTES

April 3, 2018

Washington, D.C.

**ATTENDEES:** Cheryl Carrier, Meg Harvey, Eleni Papadakis, Lee Burket, Jeralyn Jargo, Pradeep Kotamraju, Bernadette Howard, Sarah Heath, Rod Duckworth, Charisse Childers, Jean Massey, Thalea Longhurst

**STAFF:** Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Ashleigh McFadden, Kathryn Zekus, Austin Estes, Katie Fitzgerald

**Review and Approval of the Consent Agenda:** Kotamraju asked if the Board would like to add or change anything in the consent agenda.

**MOTION : To approve the consent agenda as presented.**

 **Burket; Howard.**

**MOTION APPROVED.**

**Review and Approval of the January 30, 2018 Minutes:** Kotamraju asked if the board had any amendments to the Board minutes from January 30, 2018 board meeting. Heath reviewed the minutes.

**MOTION: To approve the January 30, 2018 Board minutes.**

 **Childers; Burket.**

 **MOTION APPROVED.**

Kreamer and McFadden presented updates on how the Advance CTE staff responded to the action steps that came out of the fall stocktake: defining quality and increased regional collaboration. Kreamer noted that coming out of stocktake discussion there were two large charges: (1) pushing to think about how to be better supporting and elevating regional collaboration among members and more broadly. For example, determining the career/industry sectors that are crossing over across the states. (2) define quality, which will be discussed later.

The staff is being more intentional about phasing in the regional structure in three ways: (1) elevating regions; (2) providing places for regions to meet; (3) implementation of new strategic plan and being intentional about how regional opportunities are embedded in the plan. This will be evident in the Spring Meeting. Anyone who is a state member will be assigned to a region/room for the Perkins workshops to encourage regional collaboration.

McFadden then discussed the staff’s efforts to define and promote quality. Advance CTE has set quality markers in *Putting Learner Success First* and the program approval policy benchmark tool. These cover topics like course standards, sequence of courses, postsecondary alignment, industry involvement, labor market demand, high quality instruction and experiential learning.

When it comes to quality delivery systems, McFadden explained that Advance CTE isn’t in a place to establish a formal definition since delivery systems vary so much across the country. Instead, staff recommend continuing to provide informational resources on delivery systems.

McFadden then discussed defining quality infrastructure and whether or not that is a benchmark Advance CTE would like to make. Board members noted: equity and access are missing from the discussion in addition to defining high-quality labor market demand in terms of wages; the need for qualified teachers and the desire to determine high-quality credentials of value.

Staff noted that many of these suggestions are defined in various reports, briefs and tools created over the past year including *Putting Learner Success First*, the Policy Benchmark Tool and *Credentials of Value* report.

Kotamraju and Heath noted that infrastructure has already been defined by ACTE and should largely be left up to the states, so staff does not need to put effort into defining quality infrastructure.

After discussion regarding what was left out or not included in the shorthand definition of quality (e.g. credentials, equity and access, etc.) Green noted that *Putting Learner Success First* defines our “core values” and that this has not been reflected in the shorthand description of quality. We need to be more articulate and explicit about the core values, especially when we think about the strategic plan. The approach may be defining elements of the quality system. The best example of that is the policy benchmark tool. This defines what we mean by quality CTE program. Now staff needs to think about other elements in the system e.g. defining quality credential of value or defining quality work based learning. The Board agreed on this approach and Green clarified that moving forward, staff would focus on defining elements of a quality system and not defining quality infrastructure or delivery systems.

**Stocktake: Shared Impact Dashboard:** Staff recapped the dashboard process and how to interpret the dashboard, including framing the current overall status for the scores for each indicator. Kotamraju noted that federal policy is confusing right now, but that Advance CTE staff does a good job of navigating the external factors. Green said that we cannot have a greater influence on federal policy without additional capacity (e.g., lobbying on the Higher Education Act (HEA), doing an analysis of round two plans for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), working more on appropriations and preparing states for Perkins reauthorization all require additional staff capacity). Kreamer discussed how the member services survey results show that our members view Advance CTE as an expert on Perkins, but not as much so for WIOA and HEA. It was noted that rewriting Perkins plans upon reauthorization is a huge undertaking that has an impact for years. Childers would like a template form Advance CTE that guides state plan development, something that is personalized for state context, but could have other commonalities across states. The idea that Advance CTE must focus on the things that make the greatest difference was underscored. McFadden provided instructions for brainstorming ideas for discussion topics about the dashboard and introduced a process for voting on topics they would like to discuss most.

Topics that came up (and number of votes)

* Positioning (10)
* Federal Policy priorities (3)
* Professional learning (0)
* Perkins PD (3)
* Fundraising
* Postsecondary (1)
* Middle grades CTE (5)
* Prioritizing capacity (3)
* What does it take to double the federal investment? (6)
* Positioning with strong industry associations (2)

Kreamer reset the conversation based on the top two discussion items. Kreamer noted that the idea of “positioning” was also raised during the Board’s strategic planning retreat, but that Advance CTE needs additional details about what it means to be more strategic and better-positioned. Board members discussed their ideas about what positioning means including, being flexible enough to rapidly respond to important and time-sensitive issues; making sure Advance CTE is known as the go-to expert on CTE; having a seat at the table for discussions related to CTE (even when they end); and ensuring CTE doesn’t get lost in federal laws and listening proactively to know what policy ideas (whether new or old) are surfacing. Papadakis noted that these activities require additional capacity. Others noted that engaging partners will be vital to positioning efforts and that state CTE leaders can also engage in this work and have a role to play (e.g., serving on boards, building state-level partnerships, etc.). One way Advance CTE could build more partnerships is to be a convener and bring everyone to the table. Green noted that we have a lot of strong partnerships and asked what we can do differently to better position ourselves. Analogy was made that Advance CTE is going to the same party, but in a different outfit, or rather, that our message has changed. Now that people have bought into CTE, Advance CTE will need to take stronger positions.

Conversation shifted to a stronger ask for the federal investment in CTE. Green noted that it will take everyone working together on a concentrated ask, time (i.e., this is a long-term goal) and unity in the field. Advance CTE will need to build out a strategy and also show what the increase in appropriations in Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) was able to do.

The following action items were identified at the end of the discussion:

* Look at staff strategies for accomplishing the strategic plan
* Advance CTE will follow up with states on statewide measures they have in place that could be used to make the case for additional federal investments in CTE. Ideally, this data would show gains in student outcomes or other goals that Advance CTE could link to the additional investment and craft messages around these data points.
* Advance CTE will re-surface the module for new State CTE Directors about leveraging Perkins funds. While states must still spend the money according to state plan, they can do so more strategically.

**Draft Strategic Plan**: Kreamer and Green walked through the draft strategic plan and noted the revisions made based on feedback from the Board of Directors. Childers asked what they struggled with in the strategic plan process. Green said they struggled with embedding quality and equity in each strategy and ultimately decided upon a framing statement that addressed both. Green also noted that they struggled with this same concept in terms of positioning and decided to embed it throughout the plan. The next steps on the plan are to unpack it and engage staff in strategic planning to accomplish it.

Childers shared a concern about prioritizing Career Clusters and asked whether it should be a focus given other key priorities (e.g., funding, Perkins plans). Board members discussed how Career Clusters are structured differently across states and that changing them has a variety of implications. Green noted that once the strategic plan is approved, then Advance CTE will map out what happens in the next three years and determine which priorities are focused on over the course of that time. Kreamer suggested a revision to the strategic plan to add “board-approved strategy” before “revision of the National Career Cluster Framework.”

**MOTION : To approve the strategic plan, as presented.**

 **Howard; Papadakis.**

**MOTION APPROVED.**

**MOTION : To approve the shared Advance CTE and Center to Advance CTE vision; the**

**Advance CTE mission, with the revision to the mission to replace the words “all learners” with “each learner” and the Center to Advance CTE mission, as presented.**

 **Papadakis; Jargo.**

**MOTION APPROVED.**

**Career Clusters Revision**: Board members discussed how the timing of revisions to the Career Clusters is critical when thinking about codes changing in 2020, a potentially reauthorized Perkins and more. Ideally, timing for all of these items would align for the revision process so that sequencing works out and does not limit the process. Jargo noted that research on best practices on the use of the Career Clusters across states would be helpful. Duckworth added that revisions to the Career Clusters would almost rise to the level of the Advance CTE summit for *Putting Learner Success First*. Board members discussed how the Career Cluster revision process could be a way for Advance CTE to position the organization as a leader in the field and bring partners together. The discussion about the revision could look at the purpose of why a framework like Career Clusters is needed (e.g., as a career guidance framework) and then narrowed down for other purposes (e.g., accountability). Board members discussed how this process could mark a “21st century update” and potentially could be a tool for getting rid of the legacy programs. Board members expressed support for the general direction in which Advance CTE is going.

**MOTION : To approve archiving of the Career Clusters knowledge and skill statements**

**and Common Career Technical Core.**

 **Longhurst; Jargo.**

**MOTION APPROVED.**

**Next Steps**: Let staff know if you would like to participate in the Career Clusters revision work.

**Note time the meeting ended**: Kotamraju adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.