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President Bryan Ashby opened the session at 9:07 a.m. and welcomed all. Charlene Bonham requested that everyone sign the attendance sheet. Bryan announced the morning speaker, Nancy Null, and turned the morning session over to Nancy.

LINKING THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS TO CTE PROGRAMS OF STUDY CURRICULA: DESIGN A 2013 SUMMER CTE TEACHER WORKSHOP

Nancy Null, Support and Training Manager, Cisco Academy Support and Training Center, Towson University, Center for Professional Studies, conducted professional development for the participants and lead all in making preliminary decisions needed to develop a 2013 Summer CTE Teacher Workshop: Linking the Common Core Standards to CTE Programs of Study Curricula. Nancy assisted the MCTA participants in setting goals and making preliminary logistical decisions for the 2013 summer workshop. The final product from the summer CTE teacher workshop will provide a set of curricular correlations that can be used statewide in specific CTE programs of study.
Nancy distributed flash drives with common core materials for all to install on their computers. She gave an overview of the electronic files she distributed: Her 13-frame Power Point with the day’s discussion and decision points; Common Core Anchor Standards—Mathematical Practices and Common Core Anchor Standards—Language Arts; Common Career Technical Core and Career Ready Practices; and the Template for Student Learning Objectives Guidance from Content Area Experts.

Nancy gave her overview of the day’s work. (See enclosed power point file.) She planned to:

- Discuss key Common Core vocabulary to support common understanding within the group
- Pose the question as to what the Common Core teacher professional development is going to assess: What does college and career-ready look like? What types of activities will help students practice those skills?
- Lead the CTE participants in deciding what document format will work best to align Programs of Study with Common Core State Standards and the Common Career Technical Core.

Nancy then requested and posted the participants’ defined needs for the day’s work:

- Marjorie said she needs a one-page sheet that summarizes information for teachers of a match between Common Core-English Language Arts, Common Core-Mathematics and CTE. Tina said that such a form has been developed at MSDE.
- Bryan asked how other counties create transdisciplinary cross-curricula. There is a disconnect between how ready English, math and other content area staff/teachers are for transdisciplinary activities with their CTE colleagues. Bryan said the CTE teachers may be ready, but perhaps English and math staff/teachers may not be as ready.
- Tina said her county went for full implementation this year. CTE teachers are now including more reading and writing in the CTE curriculum, such as how to write new lesson plans, revamp current plans, and include more real world activities with a blend of Common Core and CTE.
- Jessica said most of the CTE teachers are of the “old school” model that says their programs are separate from other content area programs. The administrators do not have the same expectations for CTE teachers as they do for teachers of academic curricula. This is a challenge for CTE directors to change.
- Doug said it would be great to have a “look for” document that links across programs. Maggie said the principals need to know what to look for, as well as the teachers.
- Regarding teacher observations, Bryan said his system is now having the principal and the supervisor observe teachers, with two written observations. The principal and supervisor meet to compare notes, then meet with the teacher to see if what was taught is clear. They reconcile their two written observations/comments with a private meeting before this meeting with a teacher. This type of document could be incorporated into new types of observation and collaborative evaluations.

Nancy: The Common Core key vocabulary words are communicate, analyze, collaborate, and assess. See Nancy’s power point for the following information.

- What can be assessed and how?
- Student Learning Objectives (SLO): Writing SLOs is underway in school systems in Maryland. The SLOs target instructional criteria against which student instruction is accounted to ensure students are demonstrating college and career readiness. Be sure to factor in the relevance of SLOs to teacher evaluation in a presentation to teachers. See power point.

Nancy: Level 1 work with CTE teachers:

- Develop teachers’ comfort level with the Common Core standards: Ask them what CC vocabulary apply. What does your classroom look like? What should the content of a lesson look like?
• Stage one: Focus on CRP and Anchor Standards. Teachers may already have documents developed in their system, e.g., a crosswalk or a matrix tied to their specific content areas. These can be used as supporting documents to develop the statewide set of crosswalks against a few CTE programs of study.

• Set this up during the workshop: A plan to publish and share what has been developed among all districts, for teachers to share with each other; then no one school system has to do it all.

• Stage two: Nancy said that we need to limit what teachers can develop in the first workshop. They may not be able to drill down through the standards in one summer workshop. They may not get to their own CTE pathway the first time out.

• A useful reference for the summer workshop: Defined program clusters areas differ greatly across many national and state governments. Nancy showed the group the National Association of State Directors of CTE’s sample cluster cross-walk among the various governmental agencies, using CTE in Anne Arundel County Public Schools as the example. This document depicts where a CTE program fits in the 10 Maryland clusters; the 16 clusters from the US Department of Education, OVAE; and the 15 clusters from the US Department of Labor.

Nancy gave an example of preparation steps for instructing teachers in the summer workshop. Recognize teachers’ efforts toward teaching Common Core knowledge and skills. Encourage them to challenge themselves by stretching to connect their courses to common core. Nancy chose one example from the Career Ready Practices (CRP) for her model: Communicate clearly, effectively and with reason. See power point Slide 12, with three columns, for the example.

• Marjorie said the additional work done to stretch the students could be the assessment. Teachers could assess how well students have done with the more complex integrated content. Ask teachers: How do we know we’ve reached the learning target? Use the assessment. Maybe add another column: How could the teacher prove that students are performing/meeting the standard? That would be a fourth column added to Nancy’s three.

• Nancy will send Charlene the multiple-column, progressive chart to establish where a teacher is, and where they are going in their cross-referencing efforts. Its headings are Career Ready practices, Related Common Core Anchor Standards, Content Alignment, and so on.

• Nancy showed another approach that matches the Career Ready Practices with the courses in Cisco: IT Essentials, CCNA Discovery I, CCNA II. She thinks this is too complex a document! She prefers the CRP match described above, on Slide 12.

• Bryan gave an example of an August 2012 summer workshop he held, where he requested teachers not bring their curriculum. He brought the Common Core for discussion: What are those 7 to 10 things that you want every student to know? This was non-threatening regarding the curriculum changes occurring because of Common Core Standards. His school system wants to simplify the curriculum: “take the junk out of the guides.” Maggie said this would be a good chart for curriculum development workshops. Sue said this would be really beneficial to show that you are scaffolding levels with increasingly more difficult and complex concepts/functions.

• Theresa said there is an issue when textbooks change. Teachers need to be reminded that the text is not the curriculum! Take out references to specific books and chapters in the curriculum and focus on the required CCSS for academics and CCTC. The text is a resource for the curriculum, which is the primary instructional source. What you do MUST connect to a standard—this is a good cross-check for teachers who must show the connection. Connect the CRPs with something that happens in the classroom and NOT a specific section in the text. If it’s not in the standards, you should not be teaching it. Then, follow up by asking teachers how they would assess the required standards. This is a teacher’s evaluation of where they are and where they want to go.

Nancy led the group in establishing a plan for a summer 2013 CTE teacher workshop to align CCSS, CCTC and POS:
• Keep it simple. Marjorie and Theresa said to keep this simple by using CTE programs of study which are industry driven, and which have direct links to many Maryland school systems. They emphasized that this “linking” process is focused on standards, not curriculum.

• Bryan said there needs to be a diverse group of counties represented in each CTE Program of Study group. Bryan said the counties are in various stages of development so we’d need to consider that in selecting school systems to be included in each group.

• Tina raised the issue that we may be moving away from the Common Core Standards. She cautioned that we don’t know if MSDE is going to adopt the Common Career and Technical Core yet. Nancy responded that the Career Readiness Practices to be addressed by all Common Core curricula link well with the Common Career Technical Core, so there is a close match between the Common Core and Career-Ready Practices. Nancy said the language used in those documents are very clear.

• Marjorie discussed the purpose of having ELA teachers and Math teachers at the workshop who could help by sharing their experience. They could be support people at the table for discussions, especially to affirm CTE teachers’ efforts. The CTE directors would to choose the ELA and Math teachers who would participate.

• Nancy’s view of how the summer workshop would be set up: Each county would have to select someone to be the workshop organizer for that school system; they would train the CTE teachers from their system in small groups. Maggie asked if Nancy could manage these processes. Nancy said she could work with the group of school system workshop organizers in the spring semester and then they could prepare the teachers in their own system. These organizers would participate in the pre-training with Nancy and then advise their summer team.

• After much group discussion about the complexity of this project, Charlene asked the participants if this is something you want to do now, or is it too soon? Bryan responded that MCTA should move on the plan for this Common Core/CTE program of study crosswalk in the summer of 2013. It was decided that MCTA will start small, pick one program of study, bring some MCTA members together, “muddle” through the process, and develop a sample product to show MSDE, DCCR staff. This would help DCCR staff to understand the value of the project and the need for financial support from DCCR.

• Diane: SLO is not described the same way, depending on whom you are talking to at MSDE, so MCTA would need to clarify/identify the components of an SLO.

• Maggie said if we followed Bryan’s suggestion MCTA could pilot the workshop with one or two systems that are geographically close.

• These planning steps were favored by the group:
  o Theresa suggested having a few workshops regionally. Marjorie said that way you could get three or four documents that could be used around the state. You would need the same facilitator to coordinate the regional workshops.
  o Maggie: Nancy could train 3-4 facilitators who would manage the workshops in the 3-4 regions. This was well received. The facilitators’ training with Nancy would take place prior to the summer, in the spring.
  o The final document would be a cross-walk spreadsheet with assessment included, and it would link to defined SLOs. Teachers would leave the workshop with sample SLOs as part of the product.
  o Take into consideration teachers’ concerns. Try to understand and acknowledge what it is teachers are concerned about: They will be evaluated on how successful students are.
  o It was agreed these steps meet the requirement to start simply.

Additional proposals and future steps needed:

The MCTA participants decided on four regional divisions for the Common Core/CTE Program of Study workshops for teachers in 2013:

a. Cecil and all Eastern Shore systems
b. Western: Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, Washington

c. Central East: Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Harford, Howard, Montgomery, Prince George’s

d. Southern Maryland: Calvert, Charles, St. Mary’s

1. Kristine asked if some MCTA participants can get together to make further proposals. Bryan, Charlene, and Kristine agreed to serve as a leadership team and will meet in Frederick to review the following proposals and make further planning preparations to bring forward to the MCTA and Nancy Null. Charlene will organize the meeting. Information from this meeting will be sent to Nancy and all CTE Directors in 24 school systems.

2. Nancy reminded the group that they did not identify a lead person for each region. It was noted that the lead person for each county will be the CTE Director. The CTE Directors from the regions will need to decide upon three regional representatives to train with Nancy.

3. The MCTA participants discussed which CTE programs are to be cross-walked in the summer workshops. The participants proposed on the following model for holding the workshops in three locations. Under this model teachers could complete three career cluster crosswalks, as listed below.
   a. Eastern Shore and Southern MD meet together – Health and Biosciences
   b. Western – ACF
   c. Central East – Teacher Academy of Maryland

4. Length of workshops:
   a. One day is needed for Nancy to train the trainers.
   b. Two full days are needed in the summer for up to 2 teachers per county.
   c. Local systems will pick up the salary cost for the CTE supervisor/administrator.

12:00 to 1:00 P.M. LUNCH BREAK
Sandwiches and beverages were purchased by a staff member at the Museum of Industry. MCTA members paid cash on site at a cost of $4.50 each. Charlene Bonham collected the cash and reimbursed Melinda Cane, who purchased the food, for the full receipt costs.

1:00 to 3:00 P.M. BUSINESS MEETING

President’s report: Bryan Ashby, CTE Director, Wicomico County Public Schools

Bryan reported on the results of his meeting with MSDE Division of Career and College Readiness (DCCR) personnel on the MCTA priority initiatives for the 2012-13 school year, developed at the July 2012 Summer Professional Development Institute.

- MCTA members’ Perkins Plan issues and the responses from DCCR:
  o No to a request for a Word based Perkins plan to streamline the preparation locally.
  o No to a request for adding a greater word limit to the responses.
  o No to separating the save and delete buttons to avoid hitting delete accidentally. DCCR will check to be sure there is a cue asking you if you want to delete.
  o Financial Compliance worksheet does not populate accurately from the figures in the Plan. DCCR said this had been resolved.
  o DCCR will address these Plan formatting issues from CTE directors: Highlighting and then backspacing does not always work. Drop down menus did not work for some systems.
  o DCCR removed the requirement to write an “output”.


o Bryan received a favorable response for CTE Directors to include a generalized response in the Perkins plan, regarding conference costs, which cover how many days/the amount/what the conference is for. E.g., requesting funds for the ACTE conference.

o No to the MCTA request for changes in the nontraditional targets.

o Regarding students who don’t pass the Bridge requirement: there will be no change in the current status.

o DCCR said to use the “other” list in Perkins to list your local school system’s CTE certifications.

- CTE Pathway Programs needs and DCCR responses:

  o MCTA request: Please provide a funding stream for PLTW and CASE assessments. DCCR response: Reserve funds will continue to be offered. What happens when reserve funds dry up? DCCR: Use Perkins funds. If you don’t have enough Perkins funds? DCCR: Provide local funding commitment.

  o Broadcasting program’s draft proposal: Have it been completed? Bryan received this from Rosemary Bitzel at DCCR.

  o Drafting program conversion: MCTA is concerned that we are headed in the wrong direction with this conversion. The drafting program is being converted at the state level, but not to mechanical drafting, which is linked to careers in the Engineering field, and is far more remunerative. Further discussion on CAD relative to the Construction Design and Management program, which is not complete yet. DCCR’s advice was to continue to operate your local CAD drafting program if it is a strong program.

Bryan closed out his report by saying that DCCR staff asked to attend the MCTA summer professional development institute so they can hear the MCTA priorities as they are being discussed by the group.

**MCCTES Report: Mike Shealey, Director**

- Mike referenced Dr. Tom Loveland who now coordinates the work of UMES for the graduate program. They have also given him some responsibility for the undergraduate program. UMES brought on a new staff member, Dr. Derrick Gunn, who will work with Mike on program needs.

- The program plan Mike distributed is predicated on 7 students per class, for new course programs. These have a regional focus. The high priority programs will be offered in Baltimore and at UMES.

- The professional technical strand will be included in offerings every fall. There needs to be a new course that focuses on differentiated learning in CTE (MSDE said the new course must meet the special education coursework requirements in MD.)

- Work based learning coursework will continue every fall.

- The CTE master’s in education strand has 3 sequenced courses. These allow people to finish the master’s program. One course each year will be completed.

- MSDE said if a person started Industrial Tech before August 2012, they will continue in that strand.

- After August, people must certify as a teacher under the professional and technical strand.

- Spring semester: BMI will offer a facilities organization and management, to assist teachers in learning how to manage laboratories.

- The summer program for Work-based Learning needs to be done during the work day in order to access businesses.

- CTED 610 is preparing people for postsecondary leadership. Safety coursework will remain in the summer offerings.
- Maintaining the master’s program: MCCTES will distribute a survey to the CTE Directors on coursework needs for the master’s program.
- MCCTES/UMES will recommend that teachers take the 607 courses for work-based learning.
- The new Professional and Technical certification: One idea behind this change was to expedite teacher certification for people coming out of industry. UMES was able to match content in previous courses to the new certification requirements. New content added to UMES courses: Letter d, differentiated instruction to address students’ differentiated learning styles. Also new is reading, writing, and mathematics literacy instruction relevant to the career area. (Could this possibly replace the current reading courses? Mike said the answer is unclear at this early stage.) The document Mike gave us includes the new certification requirements. Letters c and d are new courses that WILL be offered by UMES to meet new requirements.
- Special electives provide the opportunity for teachers to complete certification.
- Updates on MCCTES enrollment for Fall 2012: 70 people enrolled this fall. Mike is working with the technology education student teachers in CTE and there are two very good teacher candidates.
- Updates on plans for Spring Semester 2013 were included on the chart distributed, which was well received because of the design.
- MCTA members contributed suggestions for topics and the kinds of courses needed by CTE teachers for recertification.

Treasurer’s report: Susan Garrett, CTE Director, Harford County Public Schools
- Report: MCTA financial balance sheet. MCTA’s balance is $26,515.76, including $15,571.70 in CDs with Cecil Bank.
- Progress report on bonding insurance for MCTA: Sue solicited a vote from all 24 CTE Directors via email for or against accepting a $25,000 bond insurance policy quote of $218 per year from Travelers Casualty and Surety Company, with a $250 single loss deductible. Sue received 17 responses via email for and none against. Given the majority of responses in favor of obtaining bonding insurance from Travelers, Sue asked the MCTA participants if she should move forward with securing bonding insurance with Travelers, based on the quote. All participants agreed that she should purchase bonding insurance from Travelers.
- Debbie Bittinger, who retired at the end of the 2012-13 school year from her position as CTE Director for Allegany County, will be recognized for her long service to CTE at the annual DCCR CTE awards program in 2013. MCTA will honor Debbie at the same event with the gift of an engraved pewter jewel box, for her long-term MCTA commitment and involvement in the development of the association in 2004.

Executive Director’s report: Charlene Bonham, MCTA Executive Director
- Requested a motion for Sue Garrett to continue to hold the Treasurer’s office for 2012-13. Sue’s name and MCTA office was unintentionally left out of the 2012 Summer Institute vote to continue the 2011-2012 slate of officers for 2012-13.
  o Marjorie moved to amend the July 25, 2012 minutes to include Sue Garrett in the list of continuing MCTA officers for 2012-13. Pam seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to amend the July 25, 2012 minutes to include Sue Garrett.
- Requested a motion to confirm whether or not the increased reduction of $150.00 for the 2013 Summer Professional Development Institute registration fee will continue to apply to all registrants from an MCTA dues-paying school system. Charlene provided this background information: In recent years MCTA’s Summer PD Institute reduction in registration fees was $50 for all registrants from an MCTA dues-paying school system. Charlene explained that this distinction was not
discussed prior to the vote, nor included in the motion, at the July 25, 2012 business meeting at the MCTA Summer PD Institute. Charlene noted that if this new deduction were applied to more than one attendee from an MCTA dues-paying system, MCTA would be covering $100, instead of the $50 in previous years, for each additional attendee from a dues-paying school system. Marjorie Lohnes moved that the $150 discount for the MCTA Summer PD Institute registration fee apply to only one registrant from each MCTA dues-paying school system. Nicole Parr seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The vote was unanimous in favor of providing a $150 discount for one registrant per MCTA dues-paying school system for the MCTA Summer PD Institute registration fees. Any additional attendees from an MCTA dues-paying school system will pay the full registration fee, without a discount.

2:30 P.M.  ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, President Bryan Ashby thanked the participants and adjourned the meeting.

Submitted by Charlene Bonham, October 29, 2012

Reminders for Upcoming Meetings:

Joint CTE Principals and MCTA Meeting – February 15, 2013. Location to be announced.

Next MCTA Business Meeting: Thursday, March 7, 2013, Baltimore Museum of Industry