

Joint meeting of the Advance CTE and the Center to Advance Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES
BWI Marriott Hotel
Linthicum Heights, Maryland
October 17, 2016

Attendees: Marie Barry, Lee Burket, Charisse Childers, Philip Cleveland, Kathleen Cullen, Rod Duckworth, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Rich Katt, Pradeep Kotamraju, Thalea Longhurst, Jean Massey, Eleni Papadakis, Sheila Ruhland, Tim Hodges

Absent: Vanessa Cooley, Bernadette Howard, Mike Raponi, Cheryl Carrier

Staff attending: Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Steve Voytek, Andrea Zimmerman, Katie Fitzgerald, Ashleigh McFadden, Austin Estes

Fundraising Update: Throughout 2016, Advance CTE/The Center to Advance CTE has successfully raised funds to support new and existing project work, staff time and member resources. From FY2015 to FY2016, our revenues from grants and contracts shifted from just two percent of all revenue to 24 percent. Grants/contracts represent 81% of The Center to Advance CTE FY16 year-end income.

Kreamer gave an update on the IDIQ project, including the shift in the scope of work and related revised timeline. Barry asked if the payment for this work is dependent on submitting an acceptable report, and Kreamer responded that it is. Barry then explained that New Jersey had spent four years working with RTI on a research project which was originally only supposed to take two years. Barry stated that she does not know if it's worth the time and effort being spent if the report might never be deemed acceptable. Green responded that this project was a lesson learned. The benefit to Advance CTE has been the knowledge gained and the doors opened to other partnerships, notably the relationship that led to the Siemens grant.

Papadakis asked if the original report that was written was allowed to be shared. Green responded that we will be able to make derivative products and share them, but not the original brief itself. Zimmermann added that one member benefit is access to the staff and their expertise, and we have already begun to leverage the knowledge gained from the IDIQ work.

Green said that we are being very intentional about the resources we are pursuing, and we have made a lot of progress in generating revenue. Green added that staff tries to ensure that grants and agreements are in line with our strategic plan while still taking advantage of this unique time of interest for CTE. Green noted a shifting tide, where Perkins is not leading innovation in CTE but instead states' work and vision are leading the way. This shift aligns well with the organizations' fundraising goals and approaches.

Siemens Grant Update: Fitzgerald updated the Board on the Siemens grant, including discussion of both phases and current status.

Barry asked how the twenty states included in the pool of potential pilot states were chosen. Fitzgerald explained that those twenty states are where Siemens is already active in their work. Kreamer added that this is a way to introduce Siemens to CTE outside of the apprenticeship

work they are already involved in. Fitzgerald explained that all states will have access trainings and tools created under the grant.

Kotamraju asked for an overview of the timeline. Fitzgerald explained that we are currently in the selection process for a communications firm that will be carrying out the national survey. States will be completing their RFPs at the same time the survey is being carried out in November and December 2016, and chosen pilot states will be announced in January.

Honeycutt stated that any marketing materials that come out of this work will be of benefit to the states, and she looks forward to hearing how the pilot states will implement this work.

Fitzgerald asked what communications materials states would find valuable in their work. Duckworth replied that video messages and other PSA-type materials that are generic enough to be used by other states would be extremely valuable. Childers responded that Arkansas has been trying to think through how to better engage with parents and keep them informed.

Duckworth asked if the information about this project would be shared with the overall membership, as it is a very exciting project that all states can benefit from. Fitzgerald replied that we would not be sharing with all of membership at this meeting. Staff still needs to finalize the RFP process and we need to plan how to handle the fact that the RFP will only be going out to twenty states. Green added that Honeycutt could reference this during the Business Meeting to let members know that perception is a continued challenge and Advance CTE has a project underway to address the topic.

Strategic Plan Discussion: Green introduced the discussion on the strategic plan and provided context for the presentations that would follow. The staff each developed strategies for the main “work streams” of the organization. These strategies are linked to the strategic plan and more specifically spell out current and potential future work, as well as metrics. The goal of sharing this information is to respond to the Board’s request for more insights into how the staff would accomplish the intent of the strategic plan.

Member Engagement Strategy: Zimmermann gave an overview of the membership engagement strategy, including major activities, major accomplishments and plans going forward.

Zimmermann asked the Board if they would recommend their staff becoming a member and if so, what would the Board want their staff to gain through membership? Cleveland responded that the networking is very valuable. Barry stated that she shares materials with her staff already, so formal membership is not required for them to benefit, which Papadakis echoed. Ruhland stated that many two-year colleges do not understand the value of a connection to secondary, so she believes that the connection between secondary and postsecondary pushed by Advance CTE is a real benefit.

Zimmermann asked what would be useful in the Members Only portion of the website. Kotamraju reminded everyone that the question raised during the Spring 2016 Board meeting about whether or not we could make resources private using government funding has been resolved. Kotamraju also answered Zimmermann’s question by stating that he would like more information about state policy as it relates to CTE. Barry stated that the Resource Center is great

and that she sends people to it all the time. Barry added that what she believes is valuable but not used very often are the research questions members send over the listserv. Ruhland asked that any new state policy resources be highlighted somewhere as recently uploaded.

State Policy Strategy: McFadden and Estes shared an overview of the state policy and implementation strategy, including the objectives, strategies, accomplishments and priorities moving forward.

Estes asked the Board if there were any content areas they wanted to prioritize for resources in 2017.

Papadakis noted that policymakers can get waylaid by data presented to them. She suggested a scoring rubric for policymakers to help them interpret data to understand what is really going on in CTE. McFadden asked if she meant a focus on data literacy. Eleni gave the example of being able to explain what completion of CTE might mean across states and whether it should be considered a failure if students don't continue onto postsecondary CTE programs. It would be useful to have something that is created for policymakers to use to interpret data objectively.

Massey shared that her state policymakers are only approving research-based projects, which is challenging as many CTE policies don't have years of data. She asked if there were other ways to show evidence without years of data.

Honeycutt noted that when thinking about state policy – the “so what” becomes important. We need to be able to answer the questions of what the impact and outcomes were. While Advance CTE should not be evaluating state policies, we need to be able to say through case studies that offer guidance and the “yes, but.” She asked how we can have resources with a stronger focus on how to move the needle.

Estes shared that the policy profiles in the Resource Center aim to show how policy is working in action. We only have a few so far, but are planning to expand over time.

Honeycutt noted that state laws don't always stay in place long enough to evaluate and proposed that Advance CTE look at what we thought was groundbreaking a few years ago and try to measure growth and share outcomes.

Katt shared that MacArthur Foundation and Pew are going from state to state and promoting performance-based funding. The challenge is coming that we are going to need to prove that CTE works. How are decisions going to be made in the future about what gets funding and what doesn't?

Massey added that Pew is influencing a lot of state legislatures, including Mississippi's, and that it's a challenge because we can't always answer questions about performance and outcomes within the education context.

Kotamraju shared that credentials of value is a critical topic. They are currently in vogue and focus of legislators, but don't understand time lag into getting this in to system and that many credentials sit outside of education and workforce systems. He also asked about resources that share successes in state longitudinal data systems with respect to CTE.

Estes asked if there were any aspects of implementation the Board would want us to focus on?

Kotamraju responded with progress monitoring. Papadakis asked for clarification of what Estes meant by implementation. McFadden answered by saying implementation is a state's capacity to implement state and federal policy, and to ensure any legislation achieves intended effect.

Ruhland asked if we have any idea of how policies have been changing in states and what impact those policies have had on CTE. Green shared that we do an annual review of all state policies impacting CTE.

Barry said a topic of interest to her is career-focused accountability measures, specifically: Do we know that they matter? Can we see evidence that this has an impact? Do we know what the outcomes are? New Jersey is required to report on career readiness in their school performance report, so they created indicators. While there is general agreement that such indicators matter, it's too early to tell. She added that New Jersey will need at least five years to see that work-based learning has an impact on students' career readiness, for example.

Katt shared that the Upjohn Institute has great research on state funding and CTE. For example, one study found that there is a \$13 return for every dollar invested in career academies. That kind of data is really useful.

Green responded that while we don't have the capacity to do these multi-year, multi-modal research projects, which reinforces the need for national research center supported in a Perkins reauthorization, Advance CTE could create a set of resources and data points that are easily accessible to help members make the case and be armed with data they need.

Barry said that would be really useful as members-only resource.

Green said we could also share "policy fails" as a members-only resource. We would need to handle this with kids' gloves, but we could share why policies failed or didn't have their intended impact.

Massey added that longitudinal data is important. Mississippi does have a good SLDS but language is different at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

McFadden shared overview and initial draft of state policy framework template, being clear that this is just a strawman and by no means final. We would want to involve State Directors and other stakeholders in the development of any framework, in particular the critical policy elements.

Papadakis made the suggestion of including language on why such a policy is worth considering. She also noted that there's a lot in here that policymakers don't need. She offered the idea of giving a range of answers to questions and asked if we could share potential outcomes of policy choices. McFadden clarified whether we should provide more answers rather than just ask questions for state policymakers to work through.

Green asked whether this meets intent of discussion around framework at board retreat.

Kotamraju said it would be very useful and that he would take it to a group and customize it within his state. He added that because of time constraints, he often doesn't have capacity to get at basic information, so this framework would be a useful to vet it out and drive conversation.

Cleveland noted that anything he can get on that shows model or best practice – needs to get to it quickly. Best practices documents are the most useful and he would prefer something that is quick and simple.

Barry raised the issue of the different value and uses this could have to states depending on where they are in the policy process. The framework on work-based learning would have been valuable to New Jersey six months ago because the state now has a group working on creating framework for high-quality work-based learning. However, Barry said she would use something like this to go back and see how strong their own framework is. And, for a state starting out, this is a framework where state teams can work through to get started and work through key questions (e.g., What's the low hanging fruit? Where do we need to go? What do we need to do moving forward?)

Honeycutt shared that the critical policy elements are of most interest to us. She asked whether it would be possible to say that Advance CTE has evaluated policies around WBL and found that quality policies have these critical elements as that would be most important thing to share with policymakers.

Green asked how specific we should get with the framework. For example, is 'a well-articulated role' sufficient or would you want it to explain what that means? Honeycutt responded that "well-articulated" is fine, and would want more details about how to ensure intermediaries are successful, for example.

Katt added that he thinks the rubric provides more details about the critical elements, making both critical elements and rubrics equally important. Massey agreed with Katt.

Papadakis noted that the critical elements piece is the "why," both in terms of how they were decided and what makes them so critical.

McFadden asked for input into other potential topics of frameworks. Katt asked for a framework around defining career readiness. Honeycutt said that she thinks the four suggested topics are those that are most critical right now.

Green made the point that we need to think through appropriateness of these frameworks for K-12 and/or postsecondary given earlier discussions about the importance of secondary and postsecondary leadership and policy.

Barry said she was not sure about graduation requirements and how useful that would be as a topic. Kotamraju noted that there are some discussions within states about how CTE is included within graduation requirements so it could be useful in those states. Massey agreed and shared Mississippi is considering how to modify their graduation requirements to include CTE. She also added that any framework should address how graduation requirements should align with postsecondary.

Barry offered the topic of CTE teacher preparation and alternative certification in preparing high-quality CTE teachers, which is the focus of the fourth principle in *Putting Learner Success First*. She noted that she wouldn't even know where to start given there are so many factors.

Massey also brought up that Mississippi has so many rural areas and is interested in those policies around ways of delivering CTE in rural communities other than face-to-face classrooms and how to measure the impact and outreach.

State Policy Strategy: McFadden and Estes shared an overview of the state policy and implementation strategy, including the objectives, strategies, accomplishments and priorities moving forward.

Estes asked the Board if there were any content areas they wanted to prioritize for resources in 2017.

Papadakis noted that policymakers can get waylaid by data presented to them. She suggested a scoring rubric for policymakers to help them interpret data - to understand what is really going on in CTE. McFadden asked if she meant a focus on data literacy. Papadakis gave the example of being able to explain what completion of CTE might mean across states and whether it should be considered a failure if students don't continue onto postsecondary CTE programs. It would be useful to have something that is created for policymakers to use to interpret data objectively.

Massey shared that her state policymakers are only approving research-based projects, which is challenging as many CTE policies don't have years of data. She asked if there were other ways to show evidence without years of data.

Honeycutt noted that when thinking about state policy – the “so what” becomes important. We need to be able to answer the questions of what the impact and outcomes were. While Advance CTE should not be evaluating state policies, we need to be able to say through case studies that offer guidance and the “yes, but.” She asked how we can have resources with a stronger focus on how to move the needle.

Estes shared that the policy profiles in the Resource Center aim to show how policy is working in action. We only have a few so far, but are planning to expand over time.

Honeycutt noted that state laws don't always stay in place long enough to evaluate and proposed that Advance CTE look at what we thought was groundbreaking a few years ago and try to measure growth and share outcomes.

Katt shared that MacArthur Foundation and Pew are going from state to state and promoting performance-based funding. The challenge is coming that we are going to need to prove that CTE works. How are decisions going to be made in the future about what gets funding and what doesn't?

Massey added that Pew is influencing a lot of state legislatures, including Mississippi's, and that it's a challenge because we can't always answer questions about performance and outcomes within the education context.

Kotamraju shared that credentials of value is a critical topic. They are currently in vogue and focus of legislators, but don't understand time lag into getting this in to system and that many credentials sit outside of education and workforce systems. He also asked about resources that share successes in state longitudinal data systems with respect to CTE.

Estes asked if there were any aspects of implementation the Board would want us to focus on

Kotamraju responded with progress monitoring. Papadakis asked for clarification of what Estes meant by implementation. McFadden answered by saying implementation is a state's capacity to implement state and federal policy, and to ensure any legislation achieves intended effect.

Ruhland asked if we have any idea of how policies have been changing in states and what impact those policies have had on CTE. Green shared that we do an annual review of all state policies impacting CTE.

Barry said a topic of interest to her is career-focused accountability measures, specifically: Do we know that they matter? Can we see evidence that this has an impact? Do we know what the outcomes are? New Jersey is required to report on career readiness in their school performance report, so they created indicators. While there is general agreement that such indicators matter, it's too early to tell. She added that New Jersey will need at least five years to see that work-based learning has an impact on students' career readiness, for example.

Katt shared that the Upjohn Institute has great research on state funding and CTE. For example, one study found that there is a \$13 return for every dollar invested in career academies. That kind of data is really useful.

Green responded that while we don't have the capacity to do these multi-year, multi-modal research projects, which reinforces the need for national research center supported in a Perkins reauthorization, Advance CTE could create a set of resources and data points that are easily accessible to help members make the case and be armed with data they need.

Barry said that would be really useful as members-only resource.

Green said we could also share "policy fails" as a members-only resource. We would need to handle this with kids' gloves, but we could share why policies failed or didn't have their intended impact.

Massey added that longitudinal data is important. Mississippi does have a good data system but language is different at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

McFadden shared an overview and initial draft of a state policy framework template, being clear that this is just a strawman and by no means final. We would want to involve State Directors and other stakeholders in the development of any framework, in particular the critical policy elements.

Papadakis suggested including language on why such a policy is worth considering. She also noted that there's a lot in the draft template that policymakers don't need. She offered the idea of giving a range of answers to questions and asked if we could share potential outcomes of policy

choices. McFadden clarified whether we should provide more answers rather than just ask questions for state policymakers to work through.

Green asked whether the proposed template meets intent of discussion around framework at February Board retreat.

Kotamraju said it would be very useful and that he would take it to a group and customize it within his state. He added that because of time constraints, he often doesn't have capacity to get at basic information, so this framework would be a useful to vet it out and drive conversation.

Cleveland noted that anything he can get on that shows model or best practice – needs to get to it quickly. Best practice documents are the most useful and he would prefer something that is quick and simple.

Barry raised the issue of the different value and uses this could have to states depending on where they are in the policy process. The framework on work-based learning would have been valuable to New Jersey six months ago because the state now has a group working on creating framework for high-quality work-based learning. However, Barry said she would use something like this to go back and see how strong their own framework is. And, for a state starting out, this is a framework where state teams can work through to get started and work through key questions (e.g., What's the low hanging fruit? Where do we need to go? What do we need to do moving forward?)

Honeycutt shared that the critical policy elements are of most interest to us. She asked whether it would be possible to say that Advance CTE has evaluated policies around work-based learning and found that quality policies have these critical elements as that would be most important thing to share with policymakers.

Green asked how specific we should get with the framework. For example, is 'a well-articulated role' sufficient or would you want it to explain what that means? Honeycutt responded that "well-articulated" is fine, and would want more details about how to ensure intermediaries are successful, for example.

Katt added that he thinks the rubric provides more details about the critical elements, making both critical elements and rubrics equally important. Massey agreed with Katt.

Papadakis noted that the critical elements piece is the "why," both in terms of how they were decided and what makes them so critical.

McFadden asked for input into other potential topics of frameworks. Katt asked for a framework around defining career readiness. Honeycutt said that she thinks the four suggested topics are those that are most critical right now.

Green made the point that we need to think through appropriateness of these frameworks for K-12 and/or postsecondary given earlier discussions about the importance of secondary and postsecondary leadership and policy.

Barry said she was not sure about graduation requirements and how useful that would be as a topic. Kotamraju noted that there are some discussions within states about how CTE is included within graduation requirements so it could be useful in those states. Massey agreed and shared Mississippi is considering how to modify their graduation requirements to include CTE. She also added that any framework should address how graduation requirements should align with postsecondary.

Barry offered the topic of CTE teacher preparation and alternative certification in preparing high-quality CTE teachers, which is the focus of the fourth principle in *Putting Learner Success First*. She noted that she wouldn't even know where to start given there are so many factors.

Massey also brought up that Mississippi has so many rural areas and is interested in those policies around ways of delivering CTE in rural communities other than face-to-face classrooms and how to measure the impact and outreach.

Federal Policy Strategy: Voytek presented on the federal policy strategy, including activities, objectives, accomplishments and planned work moving forward.

Duckworth asked how many staff are dedicated to federal policy on a daily basis. Green responded that Voytek is the only full-time employee dedicated to federal policy work, but that his work is informed by the state policy work McFadden and Estes do, is connected to Fitzgerald's communications work, as well as the work of Green and Kremer.

Duckworth stated that he sees this as an extremely important tool to influence not just federal policy but state policy as well, and that it helps him to understand how we're utilizing all of our staff to carry out this work. Once Perkins is reauthorized, the conversation will move to implementation and the impact Perkins has on state policies. Duckworth said that he wants to make sure we have enough of the policy work going on to go beyond the reauthorization of Perkins.

Papadakis said that she gains more traction in her state when she's able to leverage our relationships with partners on the national level such as Business Roundtable, the Chamber of Commerce and requested more information on these relationships. Green explained that we have discussed using the quarterly advocacy calls to focus less sharing updates and turning them into sharing "behind-the-scenes" insights, collaborative solution-building, and discussions related to strategy, including partnerships. Voytek added that we have embedded into the federal policy strategy a focus on working with employers (and employer organizations) and ensuring that they are informed.

Papadakis asked if Advance CTE works with the National Conference of State Legislatures. Voytek responded that the relationship with NCSL is managed by McFadden and Estes, and is based more on information requests on state policies, rather than any connections at the federal level.

Kotamraju asked how the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is working out in the field from a CTE perspective, given that there is not a new Perkins yet. Voytek responded that there have been some discussions about how all of the federal laws and policies fit together and complement each other and asked if a tool that examines that would be helpful. Honeycutt responded that it is important to include in that tool how Perkins and WIOA are not duplicative efforts.

Papadakis requested a set of Board-approved Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) policies.

Voytek noted that a part of the federal policy strategy is to not just advocate for federal policy but to support its implementation. To that end, Voytek asked the Board to share thoughts on what supports members might need if Perkins is reauthorized. Green explained that with the previous reauthorization, which happened in a very different national context, Advance CTE became the organizer of three regional implementation meetings. Going forward, Green explained, there are more stakeholders involved in this work from different sectors. Kotamraju stated that for Every Student Success Act (ESSA) implementation, he was provided with a planning template, which he thinks would be helpful for Perkins, especially for new State Directors. Duckworth stated that it would be great if Advance CTE takes the lead again, as the WIOA session he recently attended, which was not led by us, was not useful. Cullen added that it would be helpful to have a cross-walk of the old and new Perkins laws.

Barry asked how others would begin to think about using the Vision to update current Perkins plans. She added that some strategies around doing that update would be helpful so that states are not stuck with old plans while waiting for legislation to change. She added that guidance around conducting needs assessments would also be helpful.

Kotamraju asked if there would be regulations associated with the new Perkins. Voytek replied new regulations would not be likely; he further replied that there have not been new Perkins regulations since 1992, and that perhaps a resource that describes these would be helpful.

Cleveland stated that accountability would be a big part of the conversation. He added that states cannot just write a Perkins plan without aligning it to *Putting Learner Success First* – Perkins is an investment but it does not need to drive the work in a state. This is a mindset change that needs to be made – the Vision drives the work, not the federal legislation.

Massey stated that the regional implementation meetings were helpful, especially if states brought teams. Papadakis added that her team still talks about the last Perkins implementation meetings because of how effective they were, and that the implementation questions from McFadden's policy framework strawman would be helpful in that meeting.

Papadakis asked if there is a funder who could help with some of this work. Green responded that we have been in conversation with a large funder about supporting Perkins implementation. Advance CTE leadership has considered drawing down reserved to support Perkins implementation supports if funding cannot be identified.

Communications Strategy: Fitzgerald provided an overview of the communications strategy, including objectives, activities, accomplishments, and planned work going forward.

Fitzgerald asked if a 50-state re-sign campaign (for the Learning that Works for America campaign) would be helpful. Honeycutt responded that she agrees that State Director turnover is a cause of this lack of awareness, and that clarity on the different brands and how they connect would be helpful. Honeycutt added that the social media tools are really great for sharing information.

Fitzgerald shared that a new video that helps to explain the aspirations of *Putting Learner Success First* is under development.

Papadakis stated her concern that a re-sign on may be premature and confusing given the current focus on *Putting Learner Success First*. Fitzgerald clarified that if the re-sign on happened, it would happen later next year, tied in with both the Siemens resources and *Putting Learner Success First*.

Green noted that Fitzgerald's strategy was the first one developed by the team, and her approach has been very helpful in modeling the other strategies, particularly as it relates to metric development.

Adjournment: Honeycutt noted that the next Board Meeting would be a conference call on January 26, 2017. The Joint Board meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.