

# Title of Meeting

## March Meeting Notes

2-4 pm  
 March 12, 2026  
 Zoom

### Attendee List

	Name		Name		Name
1	Krista Fox (OSPI)*	9	Tory Gering*	17	Taelar Shelton*
2	Kari Morgan (OSPI)*	10	Wes Allen*	18	Kimberly Hetrick
3	Heather Rees (OSPI)*	11	Nora Zollweg*	19	Morgan Irwin
4	Ellie Palmer (OSPI)*	12	Marie Bruin*	20	Ingrid Stegemoeller
5	Michelle Spenser	13	Rachel Wabeke	21	Erin Frasier
6	Tom Walker	14	Reuben Argel	22	Katelyn Kean*
7	Tia Rivera	15	Wade Larson*		
8	Sarah Patterson	16	Kristin Murphy*		

*\*Indicates the member was in attendance*

### Welcome & Opening

- Our agenda today includes completing Task A Recommendations & discussing Task B Best Practices.

### Task A: Recommendations

- The group reviewed and discussed proposed edits to the Task A Recommendations. Revisions incorporated feedback gathered from members at the previous meeting as well as submissions via the Padlet. It was noted that these Recommendations would be presented in the report with a background on why we are making the Recommendation. This would include additional context and barriers mentioned that led us to the Recommendations. The objective is to finalize Recommendations in a form suitable for inclusion in the final legislative report so that the group to advance to Task B. The following points were discussed for each Recommendation:
- **Updated Draft Recommendation 1: The CTE Task Force recommends that the Legislature establish and fund Regional CTE Advisory Groups.**
  - **Details associated with this Recommendation: Advisory groups should be composed of employers, districts, workforce development, WDC board, labor, unions, and post-secondary partners. The goal of this is to seek to increase collaboration, share resources, and reduce duplication. General Advisory Councils would feed into the regional groups. Subcommittees of the Regional CTE Advisory Groups would include sector-based collaborative learning networks.**
    - Concern was raised at the previous meeting regarding the distinctions between existing and proposed groups, and how the two would collaborate. The Recommendation was revised, as reflected in the draft above. After reviewing the revised Recommendation, the following is what

was recommended:

- Sectors and industry partners provide guidance and resources for instructors, including shared curriculum and training opportunities for interested teachers. It was noted that developing regional sector groups across all regions would be challenging; however, current Core Plus sectors have demonstrated success in organizing regional student events, teacher training, and updated curriculum. This represents a key leadership touchpoint for industry and a resource hub for teachers.
- The visual representation of the structure was noted as appearing more rigid than it functions in practice. Flexibility exists in how and at what level activities take place. It was noted that a Roles and Responsibilities document has been created in the past for educators and administrators, industry partners, and Education Service Districts (ESDs).
- The overall structure was viewed as workable, but it was noted that the description of the Recommendation should emphasize adaptability based on the industry sectors present in a given area. The group also discussed avoiding duplication by identifying opportunities to elevate work to a regional, centralized level, while still allowing for customization for specific members. Sector-based work should also emphasize alignment with higher education.
- Regarding CTC advisory boards, it was acknowledged that business partners are being asked to communicate significant information across many different venues, and that this information does not always reach its intended audience.
- Advising industry sectors presents an opportunity for secondary and post-secondary to benefit from a shared source of information, including curriculum, hiring skills, and expectations at different levels while reflecting the same needs from industry and growth within particular job sectors. This approach avoids duplication and streamlines the process.
  - The Combined Program Advisory Council model was referenced as a comparable example, with the note that it is effective.
- A concern was raised regarding funding, as many of the Recommendations involve funding requests where resources may not be available. It was suggested that this particular Recommendation may not be a priority to request additional funding for.
- A question was raised regarding who the membership of the general advisory council would be and how that would differ from the regional advisory groups:
  - Sector-based work brings together a cross-section of stakeholders- including industry partners, high schools, and CTC partners to create alignment across the sector. It provides teachers with insight into the most significant changes occurring in industry, while allowing business partners to learn from one another about different practices within their field. The goal is to



### **and hands-on learning in elementary and middle school.**

- Edits to the Recommendation include:
  - Mentioning the High School & Beyond Plan.
  - Deciding what “Structured CTE Pipeline” means to the group and if we want to keep that term in the Recommendation. It was mentioned that we can replace that term with “Route” or “Scaffolding”.
  - Including the word “Transitions” especially between sectors. This is crucial because elementary school to high school is a long time and students will go through a lot of different experiences that will influence their choices and it could change throughout their school career.
  - Include the importance of helping students understand how core subjects, such as math and science, connect to their personal interests and passions as they progress through school.
- *Group Decision: The group has agreed that this Recommendation needs to be word-smithed before it is put in the final report. It will also be important to include narrative in the report for this Recommendation regarding the challenges that are happening and the results that could happen based on if the Recommendation was put into place.*
- **Draft Recommendation 4: The CTE Task Force recommends that school districts implement family and community education programs about career connected learning pathways, ensuring all families understand opportunities beyond traditional university tracks.**
  - **Details associated with this Recommendation: OSPI should provide template family education materials that can be customized to district programs offered. Templates should include future possible jobs, wages, and additional training, and should be provided in multiple languages.**
    - It was noted to be consistent and not say the word pathway in this Recommendation. A different term is needed.
    - A question was raised about how this Recommendation is different from Recommendation 3 above.
      - It was noted that Recommendation 3 focuses on reaching students directly, helping them recognize their own interests, skills, and future goals, while Recommendation 4 focuses on reaching families, building awareness of available programs, and supporting districts in articulating and developing materials around those programs.
      - It was then discussed that both Recommendations do rely on each other and are symbiotic. It was recommended to combine Recommendations 3 & 4.
  - *Group Decision: The group has agreed that this Recommendation should be combined with Recommendation 3 with the edits suggested for both Recommendations.*

- **Draft Recommendation 5: The CTE Task Force recommends that the Legislature increase the CTE apportionment rate.**
  - *Group Decision: The group agrees with this Recommendation but would like to provide background on the 'why' in the report to provide additional context.*
- **Draft Recommendation 6: The CTE Task Force recommends that the Legislature fund a dedicated career connected learning coordinator at every high school to manage work-based learning activities and programs.**
  - **Details associated with this Recommendation: It supports High School & Beyond plans through integration with administrative staff, coordinates with the team, and includes integration of staff.**
  - *Group Decision: The group agrees with this Recommendation and would like to combine it with Recommendation 5 above.*
- **Draft Recommendation 7: The CTE Task Force recommends that OSPI and CTE partners work together to create a glossary of terms and work towards clear, concise and consistent terminology.**
  - It was discussed to call out who the CTE partners would be so that the Legislature is aware. Provide a list with a diverse group of people.
  - *Group Decision: The group approves this Recommendation with the small edit mentioned above.*
- **Draft Recommendation 8: The CTE Task Force recommends that instructors be required to spend time working in their respective fields in order to renew their certification.**
  - **Details associated with this Recommendation: This is similar to the "Return to Industry" program but a funding mechanism would be needed.**
    - It was discussed that guardrails would need to be added to this Recommendation. Include how teachers would maintain a sense of skill attainment and to find ways to continue upskilling.
    - It was noted that maybe sector funding could include money for teachers to spend time in industry.
  - *Group Decision: The group approves this Recommendation with the small edits mentioned above.*

### **Task B: Best Practices**

- **Task B states that the Task Force shall make recommendations for the successful administration and operation of CTE Core Plus programs through appropriate collaboration with industry sector leadership. This means to continue the work for and support of current and future Core Plus programs.**
- The group discussed Best Practices for the following prompts:
  - **Collaboration–What does appropriate collaboration with industry sector leadership look like?**
    - It was noted that sector leads need visibility into what other sectors are doing, and that regular opportunities to share feedback and learn from one another would be beneficial. OSPI should be included in those conversations.
    - A question was raised about how sector leads would be established, given

that each industry needs a designated sector lead.

- The expectation of an industry representative stepping up to provide curriculum and ongoing professional development for teachers at no cost was acknowledged as a significant commitment.
- It was further noted that, with funding no longer available, the level of commitment required would need to be substantial.
- The need to clearly define what it means and what it takes to be a sector lead was discussed.
- Common goals, resource sharing, and accountability through an advisory board were identified as key components of an effective sector lead structure.
- The challenges of sustaining sector lead work through a non-profit during funding gaps were acknowledged.
- Sector leads have expressed feeling disconnected from both OSPI and from one another.
- Regular statewide convenings of sector leads were proposed as a means of addressing that disconnect.
- It was noted that funding had previously served as an incentive that required and reinforced collaboration.
- A question was raised about whether there should be formal requirements or a defined process for becoming a sector lead.
  - The structure used for becoming a CTSO was referenced as a potential model.
  - The concept of an industry coalition pitching to a governing body to become a Core Plus sector in the state was discussed.
  - A recommendation was proposed that each sector define a sector lead as a requirement for becoming Core Plus.
- **Continuous Improvement– How can we continue to collaborate with industry to inform the administration and continual improvement of programs?**
  - It was discussed that direct hiring pipelines should be examined to identify opportunities to expand hands-on experiences and industry-recognized credentials.
- **Data Outcomes– How can we continue to collaborate with industry to review data outcomes?**
  - The Core Plus grant structure was mentioned as a model for data collection that was extremely helpful.
    - It was noted that when districts receive grant funding, reporting back to sectors produces valuable data.
    - Grant requirements mandated data collection from districts.
    - It was observed that compliance with grant requirements (doing the right thing) was effectively incentivized through the funding structure.

- **Program Recommendations– How can we continue to collaborate with industry to recommend program improvements?**
  - It was suggested that OSPI establish a process for receiving feedback from sector leads.
  - It was also suggested that feedback be gathered from recent program graduates to identify what was working well and what may be missing, including any skill sets that were not adequately addressed.
- **Industry Competencies– How can we continue to collaborate with industry to ensure that programs reflect applicable industry competencies and identify appropriate program credentials?**
  - It was noted that collaboration is essential, and that the same connective approach needed between K–12 and post-secondary partners also applies to business-level partners. This alignment across all three groups leads to better outcomes for students.
- **Funding Notes:**
  - It was suggested that the report clearly articulate that while industry collaboration is being requested, it is not currently being funded. The report should also explain why and how the model worked historically, with the acknowledgment that it functioned well only when funding was in place.
  - A recommendation was made that sector leads be given the opportunity to provide input on how the loss of funding has negatively impacted their programs and teachers.
  - It was emphasized that meaningful collaboration and related efforts require investment to be realized and cannot be sustained without dedicated funding.

### **Wrap Up & Next Steps**

- Additional feedback is welcome to be provided in written format. We will continue to adjust recommendation verbiage and timelines as needed to capture the committee's perspective.
- We will leave the Padlet open for further response.  
<https://padlet.com/elliepalmer/taskforcetaskb>.
- Next Meeting: April 9, 2–4 pm.