

**The Center to Advance CTE Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES**

Omni Shoreham Hotel

Washington, DC

May 1, 2017 3:15pm to 5:15pm

Attendees: Hillary Wells, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Pradeep Kotamraju, Rod Duckworth, Tim Hodges

Absent: Cheryl Carrier

Staff Attending: Kate Kreamer, Kimberly Green, Austin Estes

Welcome, Overview of Agenda: Honeycutt introduced the group and asked Kotamraju to go over the minutes.

Approval of January 29, 2017 Minutes: Kotamraju asked for a motion to approve the January 29, 2017 minutes. Hodges pointed out that his name is misspelled in the minutes but agreed to approve the minutes with the correction made.

**MOTION: To approve the January 29, 2017 Center to Advance CTE Board Minutes. Hodges; Wells.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

The Center to Advance CTE Financial Reports: Kotamraju reminded the Board that Phillip Cleveland is stepping down from his position as Secretary/Treasurer. Kotamraju is taking over his responsibilities in the interim with the finance committee. The financial situation is good. Now that The Center is receiving more income through grant activity rather than Career Cluster work, The Center will take a different approach to reporting finances.

Green explained that The Center has been in a growth period, which is reflected in the Board report. The Center has taken on new grants through Siemens, DoDEA and others. Green explained that, due to limitations on short-term grants, the Board needs to decide how to invest the money in the interim. Merrill Lynch charges a one percent fee for managing The Center's investment portfolio, but due to short-term grants, Merrill Lynch's investment fee exceeded the amount earned in the market. Green presented two alternatives: Either using a certificate of deposit (CD) or putting the grants into a money market account. Due to FDIC limits, the total amount would not be insured in a checking account.

Honeycutt asked what rate we would receive on CDs, to which Green responded that the account would have less than half a percent return. Honeycutt that it wouldn't be worth putting our money there for a marginal return.

Hodges asked how much the investments are worth, to which Green responded between \$250,000 and \$275,000.

Hodges asked if we need to change our investment policy if we want to put money outside of the portfolio. Green talked to The Center's investment manager, who said there is a clause that says the policy only applies to funds that are in the portfolio.

**MOTION: To approve the financial report as is.
Wells; Duckworth.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

Honeycutt clarified that The Center is not changing the investment plan itself.

**MOTION: To allow the Center's executive director to move funds tied to grant projects from the cash account of the investment portfolio to a new money market account that would be set up for the purpose of those projects.
Hodges; Duckworth.
MOTION ADOPTED.**

FY18 Election- Public Member Position and Discussion: Honeycutt reminded the Board that Hodges is stepping down June 30th and posed the question of who the right person might be to fill the public member position.

Kreamer provided context about The Center's theory of change and how the Center's recent Board appointments have been strategic to advance The Center's mission. Green said Wells' spot is the priority partner, while Carrier is the employer representative.

Wells asked what we're losing from Hodges moving off the Board. Hodges said there's a name that came up from Apple and asked if that was still an option. He isn't advocating for their nomination, but was curious about the status.

Kotamraju asked if the position has to be filled by an employer representative or if they can be from a trade association, chamber, etc.

Wells suggested Svetlana Darche from WestEd. Kreamer explained Svetlana's work in CTE and work with the states. Wells also suggested Nicholas Pinchuk from Snap-on tools or Michael Rowe from the Mike Rowe foundation. Kreamer raised concerns about Rowe staying on message, given the recent Edge Research communications findings, but we could provide talking points.

Green posed the question of having a CTSO representative join the board. Duckworth asked about the NCC-CTSO appointed lead, but Kreamer said the position changes every year. Duckworth said he would like to have someone on the Board who can speak broadly to national issues rather than state-specific issues.

Kreamer said a big gap on the board is in postsecondary and suggested there is a national vacuum in this space and an opportunity for new voices to take a bigger role.

Duckworth suggested we should wait until we get the right person rather than fill the position for the sake of filling it.

Wells suggested there is a lot of traction in the middle school space if we're looking for a representative from an area where a need is not being met.

Honeycutt asked Board members to keep thinking about who to invite. Hodges raise that Terri Tchorzynski, the 2017 school counselor of the year, could be a viable candidate. Kreamer shared that Advance CTE has an MOU with the American School Counselors Association to do additional research. Kotamraju talked about the importance of moving into a space where we could marry counseling and CTE and argued that the only reason counselors in Iowa knew about CTE was because of new legislation.

Duckworth asked if there's another organization out there that works in our space that could add value to our work, given their knowledge of what it would take to move the work forward.

Career Clusters Task Force: Update and Discussion: Green explained that the Common Career Technical Core is going to be five years old and is ready for an update or revalidation. Green also raised that The Center has been in this work since 2001 and that the National Career Clusters® Framework may need to be revised, given the different environment and growing momentum around career pathways. She explained that this is another project Danielle Mezera, the former state CTE director from Tennessee, will be supporting and that, since different practitioners use the Clusters in their work, any changes to the framework could have a cascading effect. Green asked the Board what they think the scope of the task force should be.

Duckworth asked if the Board is in agreement to continue in a leadership role with the Career Clusters initiative into the future. Kotamraju suggested that The Center should stay in this space, especially because on the secondary side the Career Clusters are used to identify CIP codes. He argued that, if we don't do it, someone else will because it's important. There is also a data/accountability argument for staying in the Career Clusters business, since OCTAE still requires states to report data by Cluster. Kotamraju posed the question of whether we should create standards and let states pick up from there.

Honeycutt suggested that the Career Clusters have been instrumental in encouraging adoption of career pathways and that she wants The Center to continue supporting the framework. She conceded that if the tool is not something our members are using, we shouldn't be in the standards business. Honeycutt said that for folks in North Carolina, knowledge and skills statements are easier to understand than the standards.

Kotamraju said that the Manhattan Strategy Group is looking at the crosswalk and asking questions about refreshing it. He argued that if The Center doesn't step up someone else will come along and take on this work.

Duckworth summarized that there seems to be real interest in continuing the work around Career Clusters. In Florida, Clusters are just at the point of being internalized into the work. Legislators are starting to use this language, and it would be a challenge to abandon at this point, especially

with Clusters included in Perkins data requirements. Duckworth raised the concern that the way the framework is used will be impacted by who is on the task force. He referenced how federal involvement in the Common Core State Standards led to implementation and adoption issues later on. He argued that the task force should be organized by individuals or groups who have perceived neutrality and bipartisanship.

Green asked if the task force should include all state directors; no state directors but state staff instead; local practitioners; researchers; or others. Duckworth raised that if someone else picks it up it may not be exactly what we want.

Kotamraju suggested that there is a lot of mileage in states around STEM at the sake of other Clusters. He said that the 16 Clusters are the most useful framework as an analytical tool for capturing the universe of CTE, but that the SOC and CIP codes can change in 2020 and the Center should consider how this will implicate the refreshing of the framework. He suggested waiting to refresh the framework until new SOC and CIP codes are published.

Wells raised that the Clusters were a useful tool for providing organizing principles, addressing stigmas and opening door to a conversation around high quality CTE. She argued that there was a huge confusion around STEM, and whether it should be used as a filter rather than a separate category. In her experience, people didn't understand why STEM was isolated when it appears in a lot of different places. Wells also raised that the field is moving towards thinking about career systems rather than specific jobs, and that the Clusters nicely reinforce this direction, even outside of CTE.

Honeycutt raised that this is not a six-month project. Kotamraju suggested that the task force could provide an opportunity to weigh in on CIP/SOC public comment process to influence the conversation and how the federal government defines these categories.

Green explained that the plan is to have final recommendations in January in time for next strategic planning retreat. She further explained that the task force would not *DO* the work prior to the January retreat but rather define the scope of the work to come and the mission statement of the next generation of Clusters.

Green asked the Board who should be on the taskforce. The Board suggested inviting representatives from state, local, secondary, postsecondary, Gallup, and maybe OCTAE. The Board also raised that it is important to have more representation from people who are doing the work and would be impacted by it.

Wells said that some funders out there are looking for "big-impact" ideas and might be interested in supporting the project. Green said that the Center has enough in reserves to support the next round but may want to think about how to sustain this work in the long run. Kreamer said that it will take a big investment to make sure the new Cluster framework is integrated and implemented in an effective way. Green said that a five-year or ten-year grant would help build the infrastructure, assets and relationships to implement this really well. Duckworth said that states have Cluster-specific staff who build relationships, establish frameworks within their Career Clusters and review standards. Honeycutt suggested reaching out to the John M. Belk

foundation, which is interested in big-picture systems investment rather than funding specific projects. She said she had worked with Christie Tesky – the foundation’s executive director – and Cynthia Liston to fund career pathways in North Carolina.

Green explained that Danielle is charged with defining the scope and success criteria of the task force. Green will provide an update and ask for consent at the June Board meeting, though she may need to convene Center Board in person to have more meaningful conversation.

Kotamraju left to take a call.

Career Clusters Product: Update and Decision: Green explained that the Career Clusters product was part of a multi-year grant during the Clinton/ Bush transition and that the second year was not funded, requiring states to step up. She further explained that the Center made money by selling Clusters products but have not put effort into developing new Clusters. Selling Clusters products is a declining percentage of revenue, but there is still a market. She asked the Board if the Center should continue sales, wait until Clusters are redeveloped or create new resources?

Duckworth asked how not owning the Career Clusters copyright would implicate sales. Green responded that, given the conversation earlier, it might make sense to continue as is and then invest time and resources on refreshing the products once new Clusters are developed.

Wells suggested that, given the sequencing, it makes sense to wait. She asked how people are using the current products and whether there are any digital, interactive versions. Green responded that the Center has considered the idea of creating interactive tools that can be used and adapted, but has not yet done so.

The members of the Board consented to hold steady – continuing to sell available products without developing new resources – until the Career Clusters are redesigned.

ACTE VISION: Update and Discussion: Green explained that Advance CTE held a Career Clusters institute for a number of years, though participation fluctuated. A few year ago, the organization moved to integrate the institute within ACTE’s Vision conference. ACTE saw this as an opportunity to gain revenue; Advance CTE aimed to expand the framework further within the CTE community. Green raised concern that ACTE overcommitted (their structure does not allow staff to make decisions at the national level) and that there has been a push and pull between Advance CTE and ACTE about achieving our intended objectives. Green spoke with LeAnn from ACTE and discussed activating the cancellation clause.

Green raised that we don’t want to write a cancellation MOU until we have something to offer instead. She asked the Board what they think the Center should get out of this relationship.

Honeycutt asked if the MOU was specific to Vision. Green responded that it was. Hodges asked if we had a formal relationship with VISION prior to the signing of the MOU. Green responded that we did not.

Duckworth raised that the intention of the MOU was to facilitate a partnership between two of the largest CTE organizations and that that doesn't appear to have been achieved. Honeycutt suggested that ACTE's regional structure has not allowed for the creation of high-quality professional development.

Kreamer offered that, as an alternative, the Center could ask to have complete autonomy over a single strand at Vision and have discretion to select who presents. Under this approach, the Center would still ask ACTE to reimburse expenses for staff time. She added that marketing around the conference needs to be much stronger.

Maximizing the Siemens Communications Work: Kreamer explained that Advance CTE released a report on April 20 detailing the results of the national survey that was funded by the Siemens foundation. The research findings will be used to refresh the CTE Learning that Works for America campaign. She explained the deliverables and some of the work states plan to do with the grant.

Kreamer asked the Board to think about ways to maximize the Siemens work between now and October and to think about potential opportunities for a "Phase Two" for additional funding.

Hodges asked if Siemens has provided any feedback on the results of the project. Kreamer said that this is Siemens' first foray into K-12 but that they understand the importance and relevance of CTE and want to be able to use it internally. She added that there is no reason to believe the Center wouldn't get another round of funding, although there is uncertainty about the direction Siemens wants to go in, either to pursue additional communications research, surveying new communities, technical assistance to states, etc.

Wells suggested the possibility of leveraging PBS learning media (a digital platform aligned to curriculum standards that has close to 2 million users) to advance the Siemens work. She explained that the entire career readiness portion of the site will undergo revision soon and that PBS is looking for partners to support this effort. She suggested that it could be a really good distribution platform to help put information in hands of parents and students. The platform is aligned to state-specific standards.

Green brought up previous conversation with Wells about developing a press toolkit on how to talk about CTE. She added that there is a challenge in believability, that students don't understand how this can be integrated into their current workload. She brought up the question of which student organizations could build capacity in this space to reach students around believability of high-quality programs.

Green left the room to take a Perkins call.

Kreamer emphasized that we can't forget about the importance of quality. In the national survey, students and parents rated CTE highly, but only the version that was described. She argued that it is important to meet that definition of quality, and that one way to do this is to repackage and tell the story of Excellence in Action programs that meet the definition of quality.

Wells argued that the World Skills competition is highly respected in other countries. Some provide incentives to send kids to compete. She suggested the Center could try to draw attention to the work that U.S. students are doing at these competitions.

Kotamraju returned.

Other Items to be Added/Next Steps

Honeycutt concluded that the Board should think about another board member and plan to be ready to approve by June meeting.