

Joint NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board of Directors' Meeting

MINUTES

October 21, 2013

BWI Marriott

Attendees: Marie Barry, John Fischer, Scott Stump, Rod Duckworth, June Sanford, Lee Burket, Jean Massey, Wayne Kutzer, Eric Spencer, Richard Katt, Kathleen Cullen, Eleni Papadakis, Bernadette Howard, Mike Raponi, Cheryl Carrier, Tim Hodges, Bill Symonds
Staff: Kimberly Green, Kate Blosveren, Karen Hornberger, Ramona Schescke, Steve Voytek

Welcome and Overview of Agenda: Fischer welcomed the NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board and staff to the meeting. He welcomed and briefly introduced new Board members Cullen, State CTE Director of Wisconsin, and Kutzer, State CTE Director of North Dakota. He also introduced and welcomed Cheryl Carrier, Ford Motor Company Fund, the new public member to the NCTEF Board.

Fischer asked if anything needed to be added to the agenda before moving forward.

Review and Approve June 18, 2013 NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board minutes: Duckworth presented the minutes for approval. No changes were recommended.

MOTION: To approve the June 18, 2013 NASDCTEc and NCTEF Board minutes. Raponi; Howard. MOTION ADOPTED.

Review and approval of consent agenda: No items removed from the consent agenda.

Staff Updates:

- 2014 Career Clusters[®] Institute
- Career Clusters Logo Usage
- Career Cluster Products
- Career Pathways Workshops
- Career Readiness Partner Council
- Communications Update
- Legislative Update
- Liaison Reports:
 - ACTE
 - DECA
 - FFA
 - HOSA
 - SkillsUSA
- Meetings and Events
- Member Services
- Resources and Publications
- Strategic Communications Plan

MOTION: To approve the consent agenda. Hodges; Kutzer. MOTION ADOPTED.

Board Meeting and Strategic Planning session: Fischer presented the idea of moving forward with the strategic planning session and discussions that went unfinished from the prior day. He suggested rescheduling of the bulk of the Board meeting to be held at later date via conference call.

New Agenda: Katt gave an overview of the new agenda for the rest of the day and how we are going to move forward in our strategic thinking.

Green asked if anyone wanted to pull anything from the Board agenda that they would like to discuss in person; the balance of agenda items will be addressed on the Board meeting to be held by conference call.

Raponi asked that to pull and discuss in person the advocacy plan and Perkins recommendations. Barry asks that we pull out the CCTC and governance discussion to give us a more information to move forward with our strategic planning.

CCTC: Green and Blosveren gave an update on the CCTC and some of the challenges with the project and primary contractor. GSX was originally supposed to author and publish the national report, as well as all the individual state reports. Instead, NASDCTEc was responsible for the full quality control process for the 55 state reports in house, as well as the development of the migration to a consistent template. This was due in part to NASDCTEc's dissatisfaction with OSU's template design and their unwillingness to be flexible. Blosveren shared with states would receive their state reports and the policy and standards database, with custom state queries (with signed NDA) on Wednesday.

What does it mean to adopt the CCTC: Green reminded the Board of the existing, approved policy of what it means to adopt the CCTC (approved October 2012):.

A state is considered to have adopted the CCTC when:

- *Through the appropriate process (e.g. regulatory, legislative or decision-making authority), the state has adopted all of the Career Ready Practices and all of the Career Cluster[®] - and Career Pathway-level content standards for Career Clusters currently authorized in the state.*
- *No individual CCTC standards are left out **except** for those Career Clusters (and related Career Pathways) not used in the state.*
 - *For example, if a state only has state standards related to the Finance and Health Science Career Clusters and planned to adopt the CCTC, the state would need to adopt 12 Career Ready Practices and the CCTC standards (both Career Cluster and the related Career Pathways) for the Finance and Health Science Career Clusters. The state would not be required to adopt the CCTC standards for the other 14 Career Clusters and its related Career Pathways.*
- *The state has addressed related policies to ensure implementation of the new standards.*

It is important to note that a state may continue to implement additional CTE standards (e.g. locally-, state- or industry-developed standards).

Green asked, based on what we now know, should we change the definition of adoption? Papadakis suggested to hold a debrief with the states that are upset with the outcome of the report. She shared her dissatisfaction with the study. Sanford is concerned that we are going to silo ourselves and CTE. She mentioned that during our strategic planning discussions we mentioned trying not to silo CTE, especially as Connecticut is focusing so intently on connecting their CTE standards and assessments with the Common Core State Standards.

Raponi asks if this adoption process of the CCTC requires adoption of all the standards. Green responded that the current adoption policy requires adoption of the Career Ready Practices and the standards associated with the Career Clusters the state is implementing.

Fischer asked for a straw poll on which states would or could adopt the CCTC and four states responded yes. He also asked for a straw poll on which states would use the CCTC and/or the CCTC alignment study results to inform and modify programs of study, about nine states responded yes.

Cullen asked that we talk about “adapting or adopting” rather than just adoption for states that are interested in using the CCTC but won’t be able to pursue formal adoption. Blosveren asked whether NASDCTEc should differentiate technical assistance, working with a pilot group of full adopters (who can serve as “proof points”) and then focus on the other ways to implement the CCTC with a broader group of interested states. There was general agreement with such a strategy.

Advocacy and Perkins Recommendations: The Board had a robust discussion about expanding the reserve fund, transitioning from a focus on gender equity to a broader focus on equitable access to high-quality CTE, a state-based innovation fund, maintenance of effort and hold harmless. Diverse perspectives were shared, culminating in concurrence that NASDCTEc should seek to increase the amount and flexibility of the reserve fund, as well as the elimination of the non-trad performance measures in favor of better use of the subpopulation data to guide a comprehensive equity focus.

Hold Harmless: Green suggested sending a formal statement to the Department of Education related to concerns raised about the initial state allocations put forth by the U.S. Department of Education as part of the budget reports.

MOTION: Send a letter to the Secretary of Education requesting that it not publish estimated Perkins state allocations using the assumption of the \$100 million innovation fund that is part of the Blueprint; this assumption results in the triggering of the state hold harmless clause and dramatically inaccurate state allocation estimates. Katt; Barry. MOTION ADOPTED.

Katt moved the Board into small groups working on Partnerships, Policy and Professional Development for the strategic planning session. Informal notes from the both days of the Board strategic planning session are noted at the end of the minutes as an appendix.

Career Clusters’ Governance: Blosveren reported that over the last year, NASDCTEc/NCTEF has been considering the future of the Career Clusters governance model, as the existing model in place has suffered from weakening buy-in among the states as well as national support among business/industry and policymakers. While it is true that nearly every state uses some version of the National Career Clusters Framework, very few states use it beyond a conceptual way of organizing – or communicating about – their CTE program areas, resulting in minimal ownership at the local level.

As the organization grapples with this challenge, NASDCTEc presented one possible strategy to the Board this past summer for restructuring the governance and purpose of the Career Clusters, updated and described below. While no progress has been made on this idea since the summer, with the strategic planning process beginning in Fall 2013 and ongoing discussions about the

future of the related Career Clusters Institute, the time is right to put this strategy on the table for further consideration.

Blosveren suggested moving back to the old model used to establish the State' Career Cluster Initiative. The lead states would facilitate a national committee tasked with coordinating efforts among key stakeholders to deliver high-quality CTE; ensuring the Career Clusters are well-aligned with industry needs; and providing a space for ongoing discussions to help keep the Career Clusters and related resources relevant and meaningful for students and industry. Blosveren mentioned that this would be a heavy lift for our organization to accomplish this work and a significant investment would be required.

Stump shared that he liked the idea and we would need a body of people who say we need this and to take ownership of this. Like the SCASS model and have states come together while letting them decide who would take the lead of the cluster for a year or two. This way the state would be able to be involved in more than one cluster but only take the lead on one Career Cluster. He also suggested modeling it like SCASS, by collecting the funds up front for travel for reimbursement.

Barry likes the idea of putting the 16 Career Clusters out there and letting the state elect the chair for the term of lead role. Barry also stated that it is hard for them to accept money for travel. Kutzer wanted to know who would do the administrative work for this and would it be the lead state or the organization? Blosveren suggested that this would be something that we still needed to look at, but it would likely need to be NASDCTEc.

Fischer asked if we are prepared to move forward with the Career Cluster Institute with the new framework. We would go forward with 2-3 models at a time instead of doing all 16 Career Clusters at once. It was suggested that we would need to define what is involved, what is the lead state responsible for and what are the non-lead states responsible for?

Blosveren is to follow up and share what she thinks what we can realistically do in June, and bring it back to the Board in a couple of weeks.

Symonds mentioned the work of the design team and task force, which was presented to the Board in Spring. He suggested that the idea makes sense since it's building on what worked in the past. Papadakis suggested and encouraged that the states bring with them a major employer that could come to the table as a co-chair. Katt brought us back to the governance perspective and suggested two options.

1. Survey of the state to see who is interested in this idea.
2. Use two or three Career Clusters as a model to see if it works before tackling all 16

Blosveren reminded the Board that to accomplish this work, significant investment would be required.

Duckworth shared that he is not sure about the states chairing the committees as he is afraid that they will begin to recreate the Career Cluster piece that we had in the past.

Green asked if we would be ready to move forward with the concept paper with 2 or 3 Career Clusters as a pilot to test proof of concept.

MOTION: To move forward with a 2 or 3-Career Cluster pilot of the recommendations outlined in Career Cluster governance concept paper.

Barry; Stump. MOTION TABLED.

Papadakis asked that before we move forward she would like to amend the motion to include bringing employers to the table.

MOTION: To move forward with a Career Cluster state governance pilot, as outlined in the paper presented to the Board. The pilot would cover 2 or 3 Career Clusters and require employers to serve as co-chairs.
Barry; Papadakis. MOTION APPROVED.

Advocacy Plan and Perkins Recommendations: Green presented the advocacy plan to the Board mentioning that for the last several months, NASDCTEc staff has been holding both information and strategic meetings with majority and minority staff from the House Education and Workforce Committee. Hill staff have expressed specific interest in the following areas:

- Level of state adoption and implementation of programs of study;
- Current reporting requirements for non-traditional students and conversations about equity;
- Potential for innovation funding;
- Effects of maintenance of effort and hold harmless provisions; and
- Improved accountability through better defined performance measures, and possible enforcement mechanisms to ensure this accountability

Green stated that we have an existing set of Board-approved priorities that we have used to guide the advocacy efforts. NASDCTEc staff and ACTE are planning to draft legislative language that aligns to the organizations' priorities. Raponi suggested adding and making changes to the Perkins recommendation related to being more explicit about support for technical skills assessments. Green replied that recommendations have been approved by the Board and have already been distributed widely, but that as the NASDCTEc staff explains the recommendations and drafts legislative language we can get more specific.

Fischer thanked the Board for the work over these last two days and a special thanks to Katt for leading the strategic planning session. The staff will work with the Board to identify a date for the Board conference call in order to finish up the balance of the agenda items.

MOTION: To adjourn the 2013 Fall Board meeting. Fischer; Duckworth.
MOTION APPROVED.

Meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Appendix – Board Strategic Planning Notes

Major meta-themes

- Culture change
- Strategic positioning
- Leadership development for CTE enterprise
- Employers as co-investor (changing from business partner to co-investor)
- Shared success (measures/outcomes)
- How we measure success/accountability (ROI, student-centered, not just assessment based by public assurance)

- External reform (with co-investors) and internal reform
 - Reform agenda from external and then work internally to implement
 - Not an elective but an expectation / broadening audience

AFTERNOON: WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR OUR WORK?

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Raise bar across all states (diversity of quality across states)
- **Skill development:** Self-awareness of ‘what are we in the middle of?’ (systems change, development of public policy, growth of public support/will)
 - Bring that back to states to understand what change will take; working with staff; building partnerships, etc.
- Different tone of professional development – about building leaders to lead conversations effectively within their states
- Building communities of practice from like states with common challenges to discuss reform efforts
 - Virtual vs. in-person?
 - Keeping in mind people aren’t as engaged in virtual activities, but take a lot of effort
 - Maybe pilot – pick a topic area and see how it works
- Can be co-led by states and other partners
- Need stronger focus/line of professional development for postsecondary members
- **Leadership development**
 - Scenario-based training?
 - Communications/messaging
 - Advocacy (how do it?)
 - Policy models
 - Implementation planning
 - Change management/sustainability
- **Knowledge Development:** Importance of content-rich sessions at annual meetings/professional development
- New State Directors Institute: revamped, year-long, key topics discussed/ three years or less; Mentorship program for new directors
- Build technical assistance off of CCTC discussion
 - Part of evaluation – What do you all need to move forward with CCTC?
 - Explicit questions to postsecondary around what need from State CTE Directors and NASDCTEc?
- Keep everyone focused on the shared vision
- Segment professional development by tenure?
- Better on-boarding of new members in partnership with regional board member
- Appointed vs. career State Directors– are there differences in attendance/engagement?
- More regional focused events (webinar, etc.) rather than 50 states
- Broader CTE leaders
 - Encouraged to bring staffer with you at each meeting/event
 - In-state training for staff – bring them up to speed, help facilitate conversation
 - Cadre of national trainers to focus on major national initiatives, key challenges
 - More regional events – travel is increasingly tough
- **Career Clusters Institute**
 - Doing in-state technical assistance is more likely to influence implementation of Career Clusters

- How can we better leverage ACTE meetings? And ASCD meetings?
- Strand within ACTE and SREB/HSTW meetings/conferences?
- Need a clear transition strategy – clear communications about why change. Do not want to look like we are backing off from our leadership/support of Career Clusters
- redesign program content around CCTC? Policy agenda?
 - Bring co-investors together / broaden stakeholders
 - With a focus on broader initiatives (teacher evaluation, CCSS, etc.)
 - States bring teams (in/outside government)
 - Or maybe a national summit?
- One-day pre-session at ACTE on Career Clusters?

Professional Development - Top 5

1. First-year state director – re-think/re-brand as three-year (cohorts by year)
 - a. Leader/mentors even among retired State Directors
 - b. Embedded mentors
2. Strengthen regional directors
 - a. Address expectations, particular around first-year State Directors
 - b. Build time into meeting for regions to get together
3. Task Force to explore fee for service as it relates to current dues/services as addendum to membership (including CCTC)
4. CCI = what is quality CTE (national summit idea) with state teams, around RPOS/CCTC
 - a. Build time for regions to work together
 - b. Maybe with national partners (BRT)
5. Webinars – continue as needed, but think more broadly related but not very specific to CTE

PARTNERSHIPS

- Engagement with employer community still needs work
- Development of products or vet products to get seal of approval?
- Better leverage state policymakers / governors, chiefs
 - Leadership council??
- Partnership rubric?
- How bring state leaders to conversation/meetings? Get on their meeting agendas, too.
- Career Readiness Partner Council
 - Identify group of employers to respond to that statement
 - Re-release statement with endorsers
 - Put some policies/actions around it? Need to take the statement to the next level.
 - Alignment with Career Ready Practices
- Value of national-level partnerships
- More employer association partnerships, labor unions
- Build bridge between Career Clusters and industry clusters- need translator
 - Often more valuable at regional level even more than state or national level because tangible
- Significant national advocates from employers/major corporations (could we tap into CTSO supporters?)
- Advocacy groups for vulnerable populations, particularly important with Perkins reauthorization

Partnerships - Top 5

1. Identify key national partnerships

2. Board assignments (which organizations we participate in)
3. CTSOs, leveraging their partners
4. Engage employer organizations
5. Common talking points/common language for business and education

POLICY

- Stay on OVAE's front burner as primary policy advisor – maintain role as leader on Perkins
- Stay on same page with ACTE
- Sharing best practices in CTE state policy (database or living document)
 - rules, legislation, policy statement (clearinghouse)
- Develop common policy agenda or framework?
 - Concern about evaluative nature?
 - Use the Vision paper as a policy framework – here's what to encourage, issues to consider, etc.
- What are the major policy issues/questions?
 - Use of bi-annual survey as tool for sharing policy information / raising major issues

Policy - Top 5

1. Leverage business voice
2. Collection of state policies (curated)
3. Resource on state policy
4. Partnerships with national orgs to influence state CCR policy
5. Elevating OVAE's ability to support states (e.g., voice to OVAE on implementation issues)

GOVERNANCE

NASDCTEc Board

- Do we have the right voices at the table?
- Regional structure? Stakeholder voices? Public members bring resources as part of commitment?
- Relationship between Foundation and Association?
- Regional
 - Could look at student enrollment data AND types of members in each region (e.g., secondary vs. postsecondary) AND like states (e.g., size, governance, delivery, etc.)
- Make counterparts members?
- Very mixed reviews on “having conversation” about structure but agreed we need to look at regions, at minimum.

NCTEF Board

- Expanding to include other partners
- Independent report benchmarking our board(s) against others (include membership dues)
- Prioritize work – identify what projects might be “fundable”

Resources/ Funding to Support Work

- Foundations? Other avenues of resources?
- Fee for service (implementation support, support state capacity)
 - Via pool of national contractors/staff (not vendors)

- Having counterparts as members – double dues
 - Haven't raised associate member dues in 15 years
 - Communicate what get/value add of being member – but may not have enough to make that case
 - Fundraising
 - Need to be careful about mission creep – caution but not saying shouldn't be done
- Idea came up after: Team-based state membership (raise price but get up to 3 full members to elevate counterparts, increase attendance and revenue)