

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

Omni Shoreham Hotel  
Washington, D.C.  
May 1, 2017, 2-3 p.m. ET

---

**Attendees:** Charisse Childers, Philip Cleveland, Vanessa Cooley, Rod Duckworth, Tim Hodges, Jo Anne Honeycutt, Bernadette Howard, Rich Katt, Pradeep Kotamraju, Thalea Longhurst, Jean Massey, Shelia Ruhland, Hillary Wells

**Absent:** Lee Burket, Marie Barry, Eleni Papadakis, Cheryl Carrier

**Staff Attending:** Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Austin Estes, Katie Fitzgerald

**Review and Approval of the consent agenda:** Honeycutt presented the consent agenda and asked if any items should be removed for discussion. No items were identified.

**MOTION: To approve the consent agenda  
Ruhland, Bernadette  
MOTION ADOPTED**

**Advance CTE Strategy Plan and Dashboard Discussion:** Green explained the shift in presenting the strategic plan to the Board of Directors in response to a staff planning day that resulted in all staff wanting shared metrics and to look across all projects and work. Staff handed out a number of documents including the original Board-approved strategic plan (with our progress on work); a progress of Advance CTE's work organized under the new "5 P's"; and a draft dashboard of organizational metrics.

Green noted that the document demonstrating staff progress on projects through red, orange, yellow and green colors was completed by staff leading those projects. The staff was honest in where we've made progress and where there's work to do. Anything that was assigned a red means staff is struggling with it, it has been deprioritized, or has not yet started. Green shared that red does not necessarily indicate the project is failing, but rather signals to the Board that we need to have a conversation about it. Red could also signal a capacity issue as well.

Kreamer went on to explain the 5 Ps – policy, professional learning, promotion, partnerships, and processes and protocols – and the terminology staff will use to present the strategic plan moving forward. She noted that having strategic priorities that are shared helps streamline the strategic priorities and create a shared commitment across staff.

Howard asked staff to explain the map of current strategic plan.

Kreamer explained that the first column represented what the Board approved in the fall and maps it against the proposed Ps. This ensure that the Board-approved plan is reflected in the 5 Ps.

Green highlighted that staff wanted to make sure that all five Ps are reflected in all strategies. For example, now communications is represented in the federal policy plan. Staff wanted to make

sure there is vertical and horizontal alignment in all staff's work. Staff wanted to have ownership and power in these connections as well.

Estes explained that the new dashboard is a snapshot of our shared impact and reach across the five Ps, based on evidence. There will be a color score for each of the 10 indicators, which staff will determine based on certain metrics and data that we'll be collecting regularly. This process is designed to provide the Board with information so they can ask targeted questions and provide meaningful guidance. The dashboard is not intended to be a progress update on specific activities, strategies or individual performance or result in punitive action.

Estes shared that the evidence that will inform the staff color ratings will be collected through monthly Board reports, quarterly partnership matrix meetings, quarterly state engagement meeting, post-meeting surveys, annual membership survey, google analytics, and media engagement. The evidence frequency is somewhat static. For example, the membership survey data is only collected once a year, but is a helpful feedback loop and opportunity to hear from our members. Staff also identified a few metrics of data we aren't currently collecting that we want to begin to do to measure our impact and reach.

In addition to sharing the dashboard ratings with the Board twice a year, staff will also do two additional internal scores.

Honeycutt asked if it is okay to have indicators that are really different in grain size, and how they are measured against each other.

Estes explained that the staff has struggled a bit with the indicators, and is asking the Board to break out into groups to review the indicators and provide staff with input.

Kreamer shared that for each P there will be a tab where staff will put in the data points on a quarterly basis to inform our color ratings. She also shared why it is important for staff to have some flexibility given changing contexts. For example, data around professional learning may go down if we don't have a conference in a particular quarter numbers go up and down if we don't have a meeting in a particular quarter. We also want to be able to add or take away indicators depending on what's available and shifting priorities. To keep things simple and to drive meaningful discussion with the Board, staff will provide the Board with a color rating for each of the 10 indicators, with a definition for what each means, at our two in-person Board meetings each year.

The Board then split into three groups to review the indicators and descriptions to provide feedback to staff. Some of the feedback included:

- Attention to state and federal policy support
- Use of Google analytics
- Attention to whether "leadership" activities belong under "promotion" or "partnerships"
- How measure value and impact of Advance CTE's professional development?
- Breaking down some of the data by membership type
- (in the future) consider how such a dashboard/indicators could be modified for members to use in their own states and communities

After the activity, the Board came together to share high-level takeaways. Kotamraju commended staff on doing such a great job and noted that most of his feedback were just tweaks. Cooley shared that leadership is part of promotion but also part of partnerships. Advance CTE is sometimes leading work through partnerships. She suggested moving leadership from promotion to partnership.

Honeycutt noted that there are data points that are collected in multiple places that inform this work and shared that staff have to make sure that we're sensitive to that. She also echoed her appreciation for everyone's hard work.

Green asked for clarification from the Board that they're comfortable using this re-organized version of the strategic plan and comfortable using the five Ps going forward.

Massey indicated that she liked the new structure. Kotamraju asked if members needed to be notified of the new structure. Green explained the strategic plan isn't changing but framing is changing. There is not a plan to share the dashboard with membership at this point. Kremer noted that a lot of this data and information is shared publicly through our annual report anyway.

Cooley also noted there wasn't 'behavior change' anywhere in the indicators for professional development. Honeycutt noted she had a similar discussion about a follow up after events, including asking, 'what did you do with what you learned?' Honeycutt asked the Board for affirmation that they were comfortable moving forward with the new framework. Everyone agreed.

**The Advance CTE Meeting concluded at 3 p.m.**