



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 17, 2016

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room 130
302 W. Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204

The meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee (“SPC”) convened at 8:45 AM.

Committee members Dr. Vince Bertram, Mr. Gordon Hendry, and Dr. David Freitas were present. Committee member B.J. Watts attended by phone. Staff members PJ McGrew, Sarah Rossier, and Asha Hardy were present.

I. **Call to Order**

Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order at 8:45 AM.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

Dr. Freitas motioned to approve the minutes, Dr. Bertram seconded. The minutes were approved.

III. **Statewide Initiatives Pertaining to Strategic Plan (Goal 1)**

IN-PIN Discussion – Shannon Doody, CELL

Mr. McGrew introduced the IN-PIN project and Shannon Doody of the Education Workforce Innovation Network (EWIN) from CELL at the University of Indianapolis. Ms. Doody began her presentation on IN-PIN (Indiana Pathways Innovation Network). Though this is a national network through the National College and Career Transitions Network (NC3T), Indiana has been able to make it what the state needs. This is a partnership between IDOE, IDWD, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and CELL. Indiana has included post-secondary education as well as K-12, which is unique. IN-PIN was launched in the fall of 2015 and is relevant to students in CTE and STEM. The ultimate goal of IN-PIN is to build a full and easily navigable pathway system that expands throughout the learning. The benefits of this include: students having a relevant experience, students are more likely to pursue post-secondary education, and students have access to many career and job opportunities and the skills to succeed and enter the field at a level that will pay well.

The IN-PIN framework has benefited from the NC3T’s full pathway system framework. The framework includes five areas of best practice: dynamic teaching and learning, the educational component; the pathways programs of study, the curriculum component; cross-sector partnerships, the industry and community involvement aspect; career

exploration and planning, the career counseling component. Ms. Doody then discussed the Indiana Career Council definition of the pathway system and provided an example of a high school pathway program.

EWIN was refunded in December by the Lilly Endowment. Within this is research on exemplary career preparation pathways through CELL and the Indiana University Public Policy Institute to explore best practices of pathways at every level. The goal is to further connect pathways. Ms. Doody shared some of the preliminary best practice data.

In fall of 2015, IN-PIN consisted of 75 individuals and over 150 organizations. There were three “regional pathways 101” workshops to distinguish the definition of a pathway program of study versus a pathway system, educating, explaining how CTE would be involved, and helping to identify gaps in current pathways. Spring and fall of 2016 will have three events respectively. Districts will bring teams to identify gaps and recognize great work.

Dr. Bertram inquired if the goal of IN-PIN is to develop a series of courses or if the goal of pathways is to develop specific skills. Ms. Doody responded that there is skills mapping to identify specific skills, and then curriculum is designed to help students develop those skills, including internships. Dr. Bertram expressed concern over a displaced workforce. Skills like communication, critical thinking and collaboration should be taught, as these are translatable. Dr. Bertram then asked if there were partnerships with other national initiatives. Ms. Doody responded that there have not been formal discussions, but a lot of the work has grown out of Paths to Prosperity. Dr. Bertram asked how to best help students make career choices. Ms. Doody responded that real world working experiences are ideal and allow students to change their minds. Students are allowed to change their major in the academies.

Mr. Hendry inquired about the funding for IN-PIN. Ms. Doody explained that it is partially funded through EWIN, CELL and the DWD. Mr. Hendry then asked if there is any data on the footprint of this program. Ms. Doody replied that IN-PIN is still working on a statewide and regional level, primarily to ensure that everyone had input on the definition of a pathway. The upcoming events will allow a deeper level of involvement. Dr. Bertram contributed that many schools do have pathways, many of whom have adopted the K-12 model. Mr. Hendry expressed the importance of connecting with businesses and future employers. Ms. Doody contributed that future employers are asked to be actively involved so that students are not just cycled through a pipeline. Mr. Hendry contributed that having a skilled workforce is very important: not only providing skills for the workforce, but also attracting people who need that workforce.

Dr. Freitas asked Ms. Doody about pathways and how this work could entice Indiana students to stay in Indiana. Ms. Moody responded that Techpoint has been researching work in this area, especially in technology and how to attract and retain students to Indianapolis versus San Francisco. Mr. Hendry contributed to the discussion.

Dr. Bertram shared a story about a location in Appalachia, Kentucky. The New York Times cited it as one of the most difficult places to live in America. Dr. Bertram explained that companies move to certain locations to have access for skilled labor. Dr. Bertram added information about Toyota's training program. The difference is Toyota trained the students, they did not recruit them out of high school to work on an assembly line. The program started at Princeton two years ago, then expanded to Vincennes and a number of locations nationwide. They have built their facilities in non-metro areas and they are working for that kind of workforce, but they have to train them. Commissioner Braun referred advanced training yesterday at the Board meeting. Dr. Bertram explained that it is important to train with industry change in mind. Regarding CTE, Dr. Bertram stated he believes it is all about career readiness, a skill set. Dr. Bertram questioned the differences between CTE and non-CTE, and he feels it is Perkins funds. Dr. Bertram asked Ms. Doody if she sees collaboration of CTE/non-CTE in the future. Ms. Doody said she envisions CTE incorporated in all pathways. Dr. Bertram agreed. Schools with a good pathway program tend to send more students to career centers.

Work-Based Learning Policy Academy – PJ McGrew, SBOE

Mr. McGrew presented on the National Governor's Association Work-Based Policy Academy, a \$100,000 grant awarded to Indiana. Indiana was one of six states to be awarded, along with Iowa, Montana, New Hampshire, Utah, and Washington. The grant will be awarded over 18 months. This will study work-based policy both inside and outside the state, as well as implement strategies aligned with the policies. A particular focus will be on the enhancement scale and measurement of these work-based learning opportunities, especially for STEM students ages 16-29.

Mr. McGrew explained that there is not currently a way to measure how many students are participating in work-based learning programs, nor is there a way to measure the quality of these experiences. Currently, DWD is leading this effort in collaboration with the Governor's and Lieutenant Governor's offices, the Career Council, CHE, DOE, Economic Development, Ivy Tech, and Board staff. Proposed strategies include the Annual Elevating Work and Learn in Indiana event. The first event was last fall, and over 300 attended. Mr. McGrew commented that they look to expand employer involvement with this event in the future. Additionally, they are looking to create a single database to collect and manage program experiences. Baseline data currently shows that last year there were roughly 36,000 work-based learning opportunities statewide, with about 12,000 experiences in K-12 and about 15,000 apprenticeship opportunities.

Some other key focuses include looking at incentives for employer involvement in these opportunities and addressing employer concerns. Employers are sometimes hesitant to bring in high school students, especially in advanced manufacturing environments, for fear of labor law and insurance problems. Mr. McGrew spoke of an example in Kentucky in which the Department of Education worked with a no-cost MOU employment agency. The agency then places the students and picking up the cost of insurance, as well as ensuring that the work is aligned with the student's pathway. Mr. McGrew stated that Indiana is looking into this option as well.

Mr. McGrew continued that they are also looking into programs to start at the earlier grade levels. Last year a group from DWD and CELL traveled to Nashville to learn about academies, which are located in every high school. Starting in middle school, there are career exploration opportunities so that students can pick which academy they would like to be a part of in high school. In their freshman year, students tour different industries so that by sophomore year they know which route they would like to pursue.

Mr. McGrew explained that there is a disconnect at the state level because Indiana is currently one of 25 states that has an apprenticeship office run by the US Department of Labor. Another key focus is expanding teacher and counselor externships so that faculty can better understand what is happening in the field and share that with students.

Mr. McGrew concluded with discussing what has been done so far. In January, there was a kickoff meeting where NGA leadership and members of all groups involved attended. An action plan has been created and every month there is a conference call with NGA and other team members to refine that action plan and discuss next steps. This week, a group of five team members are in Salt Lake City to meet with other states that were awarded grants and meeting with NGA leadership to discuss the action plan and ensure that they are aligned with the goals of the Policy Academy. Going forward, there will be continued discussion on the action plan, outlining of proposed strategy, creation of a timeline and deliverables, and discussion of how to best measure success.

Dr. Bertram discussed the importance of considering the full supply chain and how this affects the local level. Mr. McGrew contributed that work-based programming is a part of the pathway. Some schools have created virtual workspaces, where employers, like Dow, can come in and work with students at their school. This is broader than an internship, seeing as it can be offered as a course and can reach more students. Mr. McGrew mentioned that there is currently an effort to ensure that students get a broad level of knowledge before entering the more individualized academies. Dr. Bertram stated that skills necessary for jobs are constantly changing.

INTASS District Recognition

Mr. McGrew continued, seeing as Dr. Murphy was unable to attend. The provided packet included: resolutions for best practices with teacher evaluations, the initial letter sent to schools from Dr. Cole and Dr. Murphy highlighting best practices and evaluations, and a few drafted resolutions to recognize schools. Mr. Hendry requested that these be moved on to the Board. Dr. Freitas moved for approval, with unanimous agreement.

IV. Next Steps

Members discussed meeting logistics. Dr. Bertram stressed the importance of being cognizant of members' travelling capacities. Dr. Freitas agreed, adding that half of the committee has to drive three hours, so he would not be opposed to piggybacking meetings. Mr. Hendry suggested having one piggybacked meeting and one on its own, leaving three non-piggybacked meetings a year. Mr. Hendry requested that the committee meeting be the afternoon before the Board meeting, but Dr. Freitas said he had other meetings scheduled. Members agreed to discuss this offline. Dr. Freitas

questioned when meetings would be scheduled in relation to the meetings. Meetings will be within a few weeks of Board meetings. Dr. Bertram inquired if virtual meetings are permissible. Mr. Hendry replied that for purposes of transparency and open door laws, this is not possible.

Mr. McGrew will send another email regarding next steps for the parent-community survey. Dr. Freitas questioned what has been done so far. Mr. McGrew explained that previous feedback had been that the survey focused more on parents than on the community. There is discussion on whether to create two surveys or a hybrid that will better accommodate both.

Mr. Hendry urged the committee to consider any other issues that may be related to the strategic plan. Mr. McGrew agreed, reminding members that the strategic plan will only be in place for another year. Dr. Bertram contributed that the committee should think about how the actions of the general assembly affect the strategy of the Board and the committee respectively. Mr. Hendry stated that at the end of 2014, the Board spent a few months looking at the legislative agenda, but this short session did not yield a formal analysis. The longer session next year will provide a better opportunity to look at things like retention and recruitment, school discipline, and suspension policies, among other things. Mr. Hendry stressed the importance of their role to report to the general assembly. Additionally, it is not too early to begin discussing plans for the next general assembly. Dr. Freitas suggested discussing and starting to take positions on bills in the future, or perhaps provide testimony or something in writing for the education committee. Mr. Hendry inquired about what education issues will be discussed in summer study committees. Mr. McGrew stated that this information will be provided in the next weekly update. Dr. Freitas clarified that perhaps a stand should be taken on future issues, not legislation that has already passed. Mr. Hendry contributed that a committee has been formed to cover the future of ISTEP. Mr. McGrew added that the new committee will also include discussion of ESSA issues. Mr. Hendry confirmed that legislation allowed for one board member to sit in on the study committee, questioning how that member gets selected. Mr. McGrew replied that he will look into it. Mr. Hendry requested that this information also be included in the weekly update.

Mr. Hendry thanked board staff and the DOE for their efforts.

V. **Adjourn**

Dr. Freitas motioned to adjourn, Dr. Bertram seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:00AM.