August 26, 2018

RE: Ensuring Pathway Quality: A Guide to Pathway Intervention resource

On behalf of the National Association of State Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS), we would like to share our concerns about a recent communiqué from New Skills for Youth initiative of which Advance CTE is listed as a partner. The resource is entitled “Ensuring Pathway Quality: A Guide to Pathway Intervention.”

Our concerns relate to how the discipline of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) is referenced in the resource. As a discipline, Family and Consumer Sciences supports several of the 16 career clusters that are a part of the National Career Clusters Framework developed by Advance CTE. In addition, many in-demand pathways are supported by the discipline of FCS. The resource speaks to FCS as being a pathway in and of itself. It uses FCS as an example of a “pathway” that needs to be phased out and it also uses the term “home economics” to describe a pathway.

Family and Consumer Sciences has been our discipline name for 24 years and we are neither a cluster nor a pathway. Using the language of a former decade serves to perpetuate an antiquated myth of what our discipline represents as a part of Career and Technical Education today. Unfortunately, we have found that there are some states that do not understand what our discipline encompasses as far as cluster, pathways, and careers and we feel the language used in the resource further confuses that understanding. States have an interpretation of programs in the FCS discipline that is unique to their labor market needs.

Our other concern about labor market needs is how data is framed for the reader. For example, data from the U.S. Department of Labor for early childhood careers on Onetline.org, indicate high need. How is Advanced CTE defining low demand? Are they only looking at percentage? As an example, “Childcare workers” has a projected need that is 5-9% growth, but that translates into 189,100 jobs. Many other “high demand (percentage)” jobs are only a few thousand jobs, but those are the “pathways” that are being pushed to “replace” other pathways that already have high numbers of employees. A similar
situation can be observed with the outlook for human services and social services careers that are serviced by the Family and Consumer Sciences discipline.

Do you have any additional information regarding this resource? Can we ask for it to be reworked and/or clarified? We struggle with the lack of identification and understanding of the value of Family & Consumer Sciences within Career and Technical Education and only wish to be sure that when the discipline is referenced, that it is correctly identified. The role of the FCS discipline in CTE programming provides two functions; 1) provide programs aligned to specific pathways, and 2) provide employability skills foundational to all pathways. In both instances the work of FCS is being leveraged to meet labor market needs, when implemented with quality and fidelity. We also understand the National Career Clusters Framework is up for review. We would respectfully ask to have Family and Consumer Sciences professionals included in the process. We believe this can help foster more collaborative and constructive conversations with our 27,000+ Family and Consumer Sciences secondary educators and more than 3 million students that participate in programs nationwide.

Thank you, in advance for your attention to these issues. We would be happy to discuss this further in person or via a conference call.

Best regards, on behalf of the NASAFACS Board of Directors and members,

Lisa Stange, MA Ed
NASAFACS President 2018/19