

The Center to Advance CTE Board of Directors' Meeting
MINUTES

November 17, 2020

Zoom call

ATTENDEES: Sarah Heath, Laura Scheibe, Bernadette Howard, Marcie Mack, Alex Harris

NOT PRESENT: Nicole Smith, Wendi Safstrom

STAFF: Kimberly Green, Kate Kreamer, Austin Estes, Katie Fitzgerald, Krissy Haynes, Meghan Wills

Welcome: Heath called the meeting to order at 4:06 PM, welcoming everyone to the The Center to Advance CTE Board Meeting.

Financial Reports: Scheibe gave an overview of the Center financials, which have been reconciled through September 30, 2020 or 25 percent of the fiscal year. The Center has received 82% of budgeted income for the year and continues to be in strong financial position. The income is mostly carry forward of grant income, and also includes the Siemens payment that came early. Interest is already exceeding budgeted income by 17 percent.

Expenses are at 15 percent of budget, which is typical for this time of year. Expenses are primarily staff related costs and rent. A budget modification for the Board retreat is likely as it will be held virtually instead of in-person.

Heath asked for approval of the financial reports.

MOTION: To approve financial reports, as presented.
Mack; Howard.
MOTION APPROVED.

Budget Modification: Kreamer reviewed The Center to Advance CTE proposed budget amendment. The Center will receive three sub-grant agreements as a result of participation on the College High School Alliance (CHSA) Steering Committee. The first sub-grant is from Joyce, which is a two-year grant. The first payment of \$30,000 has already been received, and a second payment will be received next fiscal year. The budget amendment would set the income and expenses for the new Joyce CHSA grant at \$30,000. The second budget amendment is for the ECMC grant, which will have \$16,000 in income and expenses carried forward into FY22. This reduces the income and expense for this fiscal year to \$303,250. The Center to Advance CTE budget remains balanced with the total income and expenses now \$3,317,193.43.

Heath asked for approval of the budget modification.

MOTION: To approve proposed budget modification, as presented.
Mack; Scheibe.
MOTION APPROVED.

Career Clusters® Working Session: Wills kicked off a Career Clusters working session. The purpose of the session is to gather input on required elements of a renewed National Career Clusters Framework, and to discuss and gather input on options for Framework users to submit innovative ideas. The next step of the project is focused on soliciting ideas to ensure The Framework is a modern construct, reflective of the future of work, and adaptable to the current and emerging needs of learners and the workplace. Wills shared the approved renewed purpose statement: The National Career Clusters Framework provides structural alignment and a common language to bridge education and work; empowering each learner to explore, decide, and prepare for dynamic and evolving careers.

The proposed required elements of the renewed Framework are:

- The Framework must be national in scope, yet it must provide flexibility and allow for varied uses at the state and local levels.
- A firm commitment to equity and quality must be part of the renewed Framework.
- No component or construct of The Framework is off-limits for revision and/or reconsideration.
- A process that results in The Framework remaining largely “as-is” with only a few modifications would be perceived as a failure.
- The Framework must be simple and understandable.
- The Framework must provide a common/shared language for multiple audiences and must speak to a variety of stakeholders: business and industry, educators, parents, students, and others.
- The Framework must provide a structure by which to organize CTE programs that encompass the entire world of work.
- The Framework must provide structural alignment to bridge education and work.
- The Framework must be learner-centered and support CTE learners to explore, decide and prepare for dynamic and evolving careers.
- The Framework must accommodate career pathways and advisement across a broad spectrum of careers.
- The Framework must continue to be relevant for the full continuum of CTE (secondary, postsecondary and adult CTE).
- The Framework must accommodate business and industry by being responsive to their needs, as well as be responsive to new and emerging industries and occupations and program expansion.

Wills asked for high level feedback on the concept. She posed the following discussion questions: 1) are there questions about how the required elements will be used; 2) should anything be added to the list – is anything missing; and 3) should any elements be removed from the list.

Howard asked how will the requirement that “the Framework must provide a structure by which to organize CTE programs that encompass the entire world of work” change what we are currently doing? Wills explained that common language is not enough and there needs to be a structure that more clearly aligns education and work, but we are not sure what it might look like

yet. Howard agreed that she was not sure what it would look like, but we need to have it. Howard also said that it would be nice to be able to sort across Clusters and pathways within the Framework.

Kreamer asked if it would be failure if The Framework looked the same in terms of being organized around sectors, but was used differently? Green said it would be failure because the current structure lacks the ability to accomplish the new purpose statement as the current structure is embedded in a linear one-way path. If The Framework is anchored to occupations, then it will be looking back, not forward. Green added that if The Framework is anchored around competencies then there is more of an ability to proactively prepare learners for the future.

Howard noted that if we are doing this in service of the larger universe of users, than revamping it is a great idea, but those in the classrooms need to see similarity to what they are used so it is easier for them to digest. Heath shared that she still sees the need for a piece of collateral that counselors can use as a coaching tool. Howard said if we are going to significantly change the structure and way education is delivered, then we need to start with a blank slate. She finished by saying that The Framework has to be forward thinking and a different way of delivering education.

Scheibe said that it needs to be actionable and that The Framework can't be an aspirational piece that sits on a shelf. She added that the framework needs to be something the field and State Directors can take, use, makes sense and means something. Wills agreed that actionable is a really good addition.

Harris recommended that we should push on how to summarize or aggregate the information in The Framework to a top-level conclusion or finding.

Next, Wills walked through two innovation submission options. The first option is a facilitated ideation workshop similar to the CTE Forward Summit. The second option is an online portal that allows users to submit ideas directly. There would likely be a set of questions that users would respond to through the portal. With both options, Advance CTE staff would synthesize the ideas and engage a Career Clusters advisory group.

Wills shared that one pro of an online portal is that there is not a limit on the number of responses, so we could have a larger audience. Other pros include less time commitment for participants and users could choose the questions they respond to so they can focus on specific aspects on The Framework based on interest or expertise.

Wills also shared cons, including the fact that an online portal is a new approach, so it is not known whether the CTE community would be responsive. Another con is that final submissions may not be as bold if they are focusing on specific components rather than the big picture.

In terms of the facilitated ideation sessions, Wills offered one pro that the audience can interact with one another, which allows people to build off others' ideas and may generate richer and bolder innovations. Also, facilitation would allow staff to guide conversations, synthesize on the

spot and test ideas with users in real-time. The cons of facilitated ideation sessions include: a limit to number of participants, they would invitation only so may not invite people with the most innovative ideas, and meeting fatigue.

Wills opened the floor for discussion. Heath suggested doing a hybrid format that starts with online submission and then goes to facilitated workshop, which would increase accessibility. Howard also thinks hybrid would be a good idea and asked if going to include students. Wills recognized that they should be included.

Kreamer agrees that there is something in between that we can do, such as having three smaller cross-sector groups to build three separate prototypes then get feedback and ideas from a broader group. Howard suggested making it a class assignment for Masters' classes. Heath suggested her colleague, Lauren Jones, could help pull together focus groups of counselors. Green reminded the Board that this approach is timely and need to ensure it can be done by the deadline.

Harris said that if trying to crowdsource then need to have as few barriers as possible for them to contribute. Wills said that the purpose of the innovation portal is to crowd source. Heath said to get responses we need to have really good communications and also need to incentivize and give recognition in some way. Mack said that the online portal is good, but need to tie to incentive to get the response rate we want. Kreamer added that being able to submit ideas in several different formats would also remove barriers. Wills said that they will no longer require videos to be submitted.

Heath adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m. ET.