



# California Community College Association of Occupational Education (CCCAOE) Board Meeting Minutes

MARCH 20, 2012

8:30 A.M.-4:00 P.M.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

<b>RECORDER</b>	<b>CORINE DOUGHTY</b>	
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>HAZEL HILL</b>	<b>JOHN MEANS</b>
	<b>KIM SCHENK</b>	<b>JEFF CUMMINGS</b>
	<b>SID BURKS</b>	<b>LYLA EDDINGTON</b>
	<b>MADELAINE WOLFE</b>	<b>MIKE MCGEE</b>
	<b>RICH MABERY</b>	<b>BETH PRATT</b>
	<b>OMID POURZANJANI</b>	<b>CAROLE GOLDSMITH</b>
	<b>WHEELER NORTH</b>	<b>VAN TON-QUINLIVAN</b>
	<b>RON SELGE</b>	<b>JONATHAN KING</b>
	<b>CAROL COEN</b>	<b>NICK FREMER</b>
<b>ABSENT</b>	<b>RICK IDA</b>	

## Review and Approval of January 2012 Minutes

Corine Doughty

<b>ACTION</b>	Motion/Second/Carry of January 06, 2012 meeting minutes
---------------	---

## Old Business & Review of Action Items

PRESENTER

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>Regional Model – Kim Schenk &amp; John Means</b> <b>Board Recruitments/Election – Kim Schenk</b> <b>WED Professional Certification – Madelaine Wolfe &amp; Kim Schenk</b> <b>Legislative Advocacy Survey – Kim Schenk</b> <b>Retiree Recognition –Kim Schenk &amp; Bobbie Edgin</b> <b>Membership Strategy – Hazel Hill &amp; Kim Schenk</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	
None			

## Budget

BETH PRATT



**Review Current Report**

I. Current Account Status

<b>Checking (as of 3/19/2012)</b>	<b>\$205,600.77</b>
<b>High Yield I</b>	<b>\$75,388.58 (sinking fund)</b>
<b>High Yield II</b>	<b>\$103,201.13</b>
<b>Total Cash on Hand</b>	<b>\$384,190.48</b>

II. Updated P&L (see attached)

III. Presentation of Summary Financial Report ( see attached simplifies version for general session)

IV. Discussion on Quick books software approval

V. Further discussion on new CPA

- Request to develop Conflict of Interest Policy and Document Retention Policy
- All 990s and tax forms were prepared by previous tax preparer

VI. Total Deposits from January to present:

**DISCUSSION**

Posted Transactions			
03/13/12	PAYPAL TRANSFER 120313 47NJ25PNG5EBQ CCCAOE	\$26,123.09	
03/12/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$10,665.00	
03/07/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$14,415.00	
03/01/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$11,810.00	
02/24/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$13,865.00	
02/10/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$11,260.00	
01/26/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$8,540.00	
01/10/12	PAYPAL VERIFYBANK 120109 1047NJ222B5MDM2 CCCAOE	\$0.11	
01/10/12	PAYPAL VERIFYBANK 120109 2047NJ222B5MDM2 CCCAOE	\$0.13	
01/03/12	PAYPAL TRANSFER 120101 5PV225H38849S CA COMMUNITY COLLEGE A	\$582.00	
01/03/12	DEPOSIT <a href="#">View Details</a>	\$4,725.45	



<b>Totals</b>	\$101,985 .78	\$0.0 0

VII. Withdrawals from 1/1/12 to present

Posted Transactions		
03/08 /12	CHECK # 2387 <a href="#">View</a>	\$195.0 0
03/05 /12	CHECK # 2388 <a href="#">View</a>	\$1,072 .79
03/05 /12	CHECK # 2389 <a href="#">View</a>	\$2,100 .00
02/29 /12	CHECK # 2386 <a href="#">View</a>	\$195.0 0
02/21 /12	CHECK # 2379 <a href="#">View</a>	\$51.11
02/16 /12	CHECK # 2385 <a href="#">View</a>	\$10.00
02/16 /12	CHECK # 2383 <a href="#">View</a>	\$9,500 .00
02/14 /12	CHECK # 2384 <a href="#">View</a>	\$1,375 .00
02/13 /12	CHECK CRD PURCHASE 02/11 WESTIN SAN FRANCISCO A MILLBRAE CA 425907XXXXXX1960 043240001331924 ?MCC=3513 01	\$5,000 .00
02/08 /12	CHECK # 2382 <a href="#">View</a>	\$1,502 .10
02/08 /12	ONLINE DEP DETAIL & IMAGES	\$3.00
02/02 /12	CHECK # 2380 <a href="#">View</a>	\$749.9 6
02/02 /12	CHECK # 2381 <a href="#">View</a>	\$2,100 .00
01/20 /12	CHECK # 2376 <a href="#">View</a>	\$75.00
01/18 /12	CHECK # 2370 * <a href="#">View</a>	\$3,500 .00
01/17 /12	HARLAND CLARKE CHECK/ACC. 011612 00757240075402 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY C	\$72.63
01/13 /12	CHECK CRD PURCHASE 01/11 WESTIN SAN FRANCISCO A MILLBRAE CA 425907XXXXXX1960 013240001667554	\$407.4 2



	?MCC=3513 01		
01/12/12	CHECK # 2373 <a href="#">View</a>		\$2,100.00
01/11/12	CHECK # 2372 <a href="#">View</a>		\$236.05
01/11/12	CHECK # 2371 <a href="#">View</a>		\$900.00
01/11/12	CHECK # 2375 * <a href="#">View</a>		\$8,177.50
01/10/12	CHECK # 2377 <a href="#">View</a>		\$860.00
01/09/12	CHECK CRD PURCHASE 01/05 WESTIN SF DINING MILLBRAE CA 425907XXXXXX1960 008240004294499 ?MCC=5812 90		\$63.04
01/06/12	CASHED CHECK # 2378 <a href="#">View</a>		\$70.00
01/03/12	CHECK CRD PURCHASE 12/31 WESTIN SAN FRANCISCO A MILLBRAE CA 425907XXXXXX1960 002240004573061 ?MCC=3513 01		\$561.28
<b>Totals</b>		\$0.00	\$40,876.88

**Proposed Budget**

7/1/11-3/20/12

INCOME	Proposed 11-12	10-11 Budget	11-2 ATD*
Uncategorized (Beginning balance)			
Total Conference	210,000	172,800	217,109
Total Assessment Reg Consortia	10,000.00	10,000.00	8,421
Total Conference Sponsors	10,000.00	10,000	2645
101 Membership	17,000.00	9,000	20,960
104 Bank Interest	500	600	304
120 Miscellaneous Income	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>247,500.00</b>	<b>202,400.00</b>	<b>249,439</b>
EXPENSES	Proposed 11-12	10-11 Budget	11-12 ATD
Uncategorized (Outstanding Check)			
Total Board Officers Expenses	3000	3600	844
Total Elections and Awards	1500	1450	0
Total Board Meetings	10000	9270	5556
Total Conference	130000	118000	76198
Total Sponsors	0	0	600
Total Ex Secretary(s) Contractor	45000	32710	38033



Total Insurance	1500	1300	0
Total Other Supplies	4000	2980	3745
Fees, taxes	500		158
Total Contractors CPA, WEB	8000	6000	7582
Total Advocacy Contractor	26500	26500	26500
Total Prof Development	20000	0	13850
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>250000</b>	<b>202400</b>	<b>173066</b>

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Provide to the general membership the budget sheet without the percentages and make modifications from 10% to 6%. Include an asterisk on the "Total Conference" Actual -To- Date to explain the total conference expenses which will be incurred at a later date.	Beth Pratt	
Explain to the membership what the Professional Leadership Certification is at the General Business Meeting.	Beth Pratt	
Beth will look into cloud computing or virtual options for ensuring financial sustainability.	Beth Pratt	
MSP – to purchase QuickBooks	Executive Committee	
Bring recommendation for CPA as well as revisions to the policies and procedures manual at the June meeting and include a conflict of interest and document retention policy. Document retention is important as it holds the board members harmless if there is financial impropriety.	Beth Pratt	

## Conference Update

SID BURKS/RCIH MABERY

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Conference at capacity; maximum of 380 in the ballroom; looking to board members to assist in collecting meal tickets. Need a larger venue for future conferences.</p> <p>Jonathan Lightman - Keynote topic in October – Analyze how the different parties are viewing the concept of Economic Development and what it means around the country.</p> <p>Rich to send around sign-up sheet for volunteers.</p> <p><b>Recommendations from the January 6, 2012 conference themes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be a User: Get Connected</li> <li>Use it or Lose It!</li> </ol>
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Jonathan Lightman to suggest keynotes for October reflecting the different parties are viewing the concept of Economic Development and what it means around the country.	Jonathan Lightman	
Van-Ton-Quinlivan would like to partner with CCCAOE and Chancellor's Office to present at the January 30-February 2, 2013 AACC Conference.	Executive Membership	



BOBBIE EDGIN

**New Business**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
Recognize the consortia as a sponsor at the conference.	Executive Committee	Next Conference

**V.P. Reports**

REGIONAL V.P.'S

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>North/Far North – Jeff Cummings</b>  <b>CA Perkins Nontraditional &amp; Special Populations Workshop</b>  <i>Friday, Jan 13, 2012 Shasta College</i></p> <p><b>CA Perkins Nontraditional &amp; Special Populations Workshop</b>  <i>Friday, Jan 20, 2012 College of the Redwoods</i></p> <p><b>4th NFNRC 11/12 Meeting</b>  <i>Friday, Jan 27 2012 Video Conference- See meeting notes for further details of regional activities.</i></p> <p><b>CA Perkins Nontraditional &amp; Special Populations Workshop</b>  <i>Friday, Feb 24 2012 Butte College</i></p> <p><b>Regional Workshop - Road Trip Nation, CA Career Briefs &amp; CA Career Cafe</b>  <i>Thursday, Mar 8 2012</i></p> <p><b>Regional Workshop - Road Trip Nation, CA Career Briefs &amp; CA Career Cafe</b>  <i>Tuesday, Mar 13 2012 Butte College - Center for Excellence</i></p> <p><b>New Programs endorsed within the Region (Vice Presidents ONLY)</b></p>															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>College</i></th> <th><i>Program</i></th> <th><i>Degree/Certificate</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sacramento City College</td> <td>Interior Design Sewing</td> <td>(Substantial Change)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cosumnes River</td> <td>Construction, Building Performance and Energy Assessment</td> <td>A.S</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cosumnes River ~</td> <td><b>Welding</b></td> <td><b>A.S.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sacramento City</td> <td>Interior Design Sewing</td> <td>(Substantial Change)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>	Sacramento City College	Interior Design Sewing	(Substantial Change)	Cosumnes River	Construction, Building Performance and Energy Assessment	A.S	Cosumnes River ~	<b>Welding</b>	<b>A.S.</b>	Sacramento City	Interior Design Sewing	(Substantial Change)
	<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>													
	Sacramento City College	Interior Design Sewing	(Substantial Change)													
	Cosumnes River	Construction, Building Performance and Energy Assessment	A.S													
	Cosumnes River ~	<b>Welding</b>	<b>A.S.</b>													
	Sacramento City	Interior Design Sewing	(Substantial Change)													
	<p><b>SF Bay – Jonathan King - Healthcare Sector Strategy</b>                      BACCC in partnership with the Centers of Excellence and the Health Workforce Initiative have launched a Bay Region Healthcare Sector Strategy. A kickoff meeting was convened with industry, colleges, and WIBs on January 19, 2012 to identify where interests align to produce the best qualified healthcare workforce in adequate supply, as well as to meet industry demand and providing programs that are highly successful at preparing students to enter and advance in health careers. 91 participants representing 15 colleges, and roughly 56 industry partners and 6 WIBs joined. After a discussion and prioritization process, three "interest teams" were formed as follows: 1) Data &amp; Planning, 2) Access / Diversity and 3) Collaboration. It was agreed conference calls would be convened to discuss these interests further, including possible work to be done in these areas - prior to reconvening the larger group on April 26, 2012.</p> <p>Industrial Maintenance Machinist/Mechanic (IMMM) Meetings Planned for 2012 In partnership with the CACT and the Centers of Excellence hosted at CCSF; Diablo Valley and Laney Colleges; BACCC convened a 3rd Industrial Maintenance Machinist/Mechanic (IMMM) Industry-College meeting on January 13, 2012. A Sample IMMM Curriculum, developed hand-in-hand with industry stakeholders, was presented and shared such that colleges with related programs could insure alignment with industry needs; and colleges considering adding programs (two known in the</p>															

region to be exploring this) could start with timely and relevant curriculum. Agreement was reached to convene colleges/industry and WIB partners interested in expanding Internship opportunities for students and an Equipment Swap Site developed by the CACT hosted at CCSF was demo'd for use by all interested stakeholders. Due to strong interest, a 4th meeting will be convened in August 2012.

**Exploratory Contract Education Marketplace**

BACCC with the help of planning team members from Solano and Foothill Colleges and the Chabot Las Positas Community College District, convened an Exploratory Contract Education Marketplace on February 15, 2012 due to strong interest in regional collaboration around Contract Ed. 19 participants joined representing 9 colleges and 3 EWD Initiatives. Outcomes included leveraging the Statewide Training & Development Initiative to conduct a Contract Ed 101 training for those new to or considering contract ed; and discussing collaborating on win/wins that could be achieved regionally via Contract Ed. As a result of strong interest, a 2<sup>nd</sup> Forum will be convened in May 2012.

**CTE Employment Outcomes Project**

BACCC continues to lead a statewide CTE Employment Outcomes Project in partnership with the RP Group. Initiated at the spring 2011 CCCAOE Conference, this statewide pilot project seeks to address the current lack of data to validate the impact of CTE programs. By scaling Cabrillo and other college CTE completer/leaver surveys, the intent of the pilot project is to refine the methodology prior to implementation of a statewide survey. The survey will be administered on behalf of 14 pilot colleges/districts in Mar-Apr 2012; the RP Group will analyze the results in May 2012 and individualized reports & data will be sent to pilot colleges and an aggregate report released to the field in June 2012.

New Programs endorsed within the Region.

<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>	<i>Contact Email</i>
College of San Mateo	Industrial Electronics Tech.	Degree and CA	Gonzales@smccd.edu
De Anza College	Film/television Production: Screenwriting	AS Degree	goldmanbarak@fhda.edu
West Valley College	Substantial Changes to Digital Media	AA CA	Frank.kobayashi@westvalley.edu
San Jose City College	Medical Assisting: Clinical	AS Degree/CA	Rachel.janowica@sjcc.edu
Laney College	Industrial Maintenance Tech	CA	lquindlen@peralta.edu

**Central – Carole Goldsmith - NA**

**South Central – Julius Sokenu**

SCRC Regional Steering Committee meeting: Jan 3, February 3 and March 2, 2012

SCRC Meeting January 20 and February 24, 2012

Carmen Montanez-Rodriguez of the Communication Technologies Collaborative (ICT) presented at the region's February 2012 meeting.

Perkins 1C Project Monitor, Robin Harrington of the CCCCO did a presentation at Cuesta and at Allan Hancock Colleges. This was a Perkins 101 type of presentation for CTE faculty at those colleges and anyone else in the region who wanted to attend. This also gave Robin an opportunity to "meet and greet," as well as answer questions from the folks at the colleges who implement the Perkins legislation.

Karen Gorback, Regional Chair attended the Regional Chairs meeting in January in Sacramento and the meeting for Statewide Collaborative and Advisory Committees in February, also in Sacramento.

<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>	<i>Contact Email</i>
Santa Barbara City College	Construction Tech	Construction Tech Cert	dherish@sbcc.edu

**LA/OC – Omid Pourzanjani**

January 26 - Advocacy Workshop – Jonathan Lightman, Executive Director, Faculty Association of California Community Colleges and Molly Smith, Previous CCCAOE President provided a training workshop on political advocacy for the LA/OC region.

1. Discussions continue on impact of revisions to the new Perkins Act.
2. Discussions continue on the impact of SSTF on CTE.
3. CTE-OC (an Orange County Consortium) is working on representing the Workforce supply/demand pathway of Orange County from high school to ROP to community college.

**New Programs endorsed within the Region**

<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>	<i>Contact Email</i>
LA Valley	Solar Energy Design and Management	Degree and CA	nalapal@lavc.edu
Santa Monica	Kinesiology-Athletic Coaching	Cert of Achievement	<a href="mailto:Loremz_gorgeia@smc.edu">Loremz_gorgeia@smc.edu</a>
El Camino	Commercial Music	Cert of Achievement	gchapman@elcamino.edu
LOWDL	Program Approval cal		<a href="mailto:Lylaedd@aol.com">Lylaedd@aol.com</a>
Mt. SAC	Industrial Design Engineering	Degree and CA	mlizarra@mtsac.edu

**Desert - Sid Burks**

- Regional Planning Retreat, Feb. 1-2, 2012, Fallbrook, California
- Regional Consortia Meeting, March 5, 2012, San Bernardino, California

**New Programs Endorsed within the Region**

College	Program	Degree/Certificate	Contact email
Norco	Supply Chain Technology	Degree & Certificate	Kevin Fleming <a href="mailto:kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu">kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu</a>
Norco	Digital Electronics	Degree & Certificate	Kevin Fleming <a href="mailto:kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu">kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu</a>
Norco	Computer Numerical Control Programming	Degree & Certificate	Kevin Fleming <a href="mailto:kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu">kevin.fleming@norcocollege.edu</a>

**San Diego/Imperial – Madeleine Wolfe**

- Essential Facilitation Skills workshops were held January 10-11, 2012 at the Mission Trails Visitors Center and focused on strategies and skills for helping groups solve problems, resolve conflict and guild agreement. This workshop provides a solid foundation on both theory and practice for immediate use.
- Road Trip Nation event held on February 16, 2012 focused on empowering students to define their “Road” in life. Over 35 individuals from college career centers and professional associations helped students explore pathways and possibilities for their future.
- Energy Forum/Smart Grid Summit event held on March 13, 2012 focused on workforce development for employers and collaborative relationships with community colleges to assist with skill development and core curriculum. Over 50 individuals attended the half day workshop, of those 27 were from industry. Staff from SDG&E and others provided details about renewable energy and the need for focused job training. Operational efficiency, customer relations and privacy, enhancement of data, storage and compliance were essential to the future of utility companies including SDG&E. Therefore, there is a need for curriculum in the areas of electrical engineering, information technology, telecommunications, customer service, project management, marketing, and data analytics. In addition, the possibility of creating industry recognized certificates. This initial meeting provided some groundwork for future meetings and the need for community college involvement in building a ready workforce.
- Tri-Regional Cooperative Work Experience Educators meeting will be held on March 16, 2012 with 33 in attendance. This event will focus on Wastewater Technology program at Cuyamaca College as well as Social Media and Education, and Student Success.

**New Programs endorsed within the Region**

<i>College</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Degree/Certificate</i>	<i>Contact Email</i>
San Diego City	Photography	Associates/Certificate	<a href="mailto:rbarnes@sdccd.edu">rbarnes@sdccd.edu</a>
Southwestern	Sustainable Energy	Associates/Certificate	<a href="mailto:TDavis@swccd.edu">TDavis@swccd.edu</a>
San Diego Miramar	Accountancy	Associates/Certificate	<a href="mailto:LOrnelas@sdccd.edu">LOrnelas@sdccd.edu</a>

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE





**Chancellor's Office – Von Tan-Quinlivan -**

1. Communications: Jobs and the Economy – 25,000 copies available to tell the story by region and sector. We can customize the information for our college. Apprenticeship is meeting with the Chancellor's Office and will receive 12 pages in the next iteration of information. The audience will be leadership in Workforce Development and CTE List Serve.
2. Doing What Matters Framework – field weighing in on how we can implement the framework. Information was submitted to the consultation committee, League, and will present at AATC. Will have a panel at the CEO's conference on Jobs and the Economy.
3. Curriculum Process – discussions between Academic Affairs and Chancellor's Office. State Chancellor's Office can turn around curriculum in 30 days if you've submitted the information correctly. It can be expedited in emergency situations. Lyla Eddington and Barry Russell will work with the regions and Chancellor's Office to disseminate best practices. Will offer a workshop at the Academic Senate in July 2012. Will pilot the process in LA/OC either online or webinar.
  - a. Taking curriculum from idea to program approval
  - b. The new Program Approval Handbook coming out soon with changes. Need to integrate the technical issues into the best practice workshop.
4. Curriculum Inventory 2.0 System – want to be able to access the curriculum locally. Onus is on the local colleges to clean up the information and ensure the Programs of Study are up-to-date and accurate.
5. SB1440 Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) – What degrees or TMC are required by the labor market. Consider occupational degrees that the state is going to need and requires the four year system such as Engineering, Advanced Manufacturing, Agriculture.
  - a. Challenges are that many four year colleges don't offer CTE degrees.
  - b. Discuss at the regional meetings on Thursday.

**DISCUSSION**

**Discussion Items:** Jeff Cummings – our responsibility is to train the workforce to meet the needs of the local economy. It would be great if the Chancellor's Office or state would provide the colleges with information/input regarding where we should focus regionally. CTE Administrators are continually to be put in the position of having to create a local economy rather than being responsive to our local economies need. Need direction from the Chancellor's Office.

Reality it's cheaper to offer Psych than Nursing or Manufacturing. Need to have a two way conversation regarding units needed to transfer to the using either TMC or existing transfer requirements.

TMC was intended for areas with high transfer rates will ensure student success. AS piloted the easier degrees which met the requirement. There is a disconnect between current TMC's and student preparedness for jobs. Look at industries regionally and what degrees are needed.

Lyla Eddington - proposes looking at the regions and work through their V.P.s and Academic Senate to begin shaping CTE TMC's.

Jeff Cummings - If 75% of the jobs lost will not be replaced. We're not prepared to ramp up for the new economy. We're redefining the system, economy, and system. CCCAOE needs to work with the Chancellor's Office to redefine ourselves and how to best prepare to move forward.

Jonathan Lightman – CA 8<sup>th</sup> largest economy. Other states with smaller economies direct the industry of scale which creates moderations in ebbs and flows. In CA, the focus is on the budget, not the economy. What can we do? What is our potential as organization and community college? If the state doesn't give us direction, we make recommendations based on what we know.

VTQ - Upcoming EDPAC meeting with the help of CCCAOE is the braiding of funding streams. Emphasis on regionalization and how best to spend money over time.

Center of Excellence needs to redefine how they provide economic data by region. Ideally they would provide priority sectors such as Center for Excellence to define sectors by region. Push is on CIO's and CTE Dean's to implement.

Hazel Hill – regionalization draft should be reviewed as a region and discussed as its relevant now.

Carole Goldsmith – budget driving the cuts, so regionalization is key to success especially when looking at outcomes. Center for Excellence should be included in the WIB's and EDD.

Kim Schenk – Task – CCCAOE to work strategically with the regions to determine the TMC's to pursue. Work with Michelle Pilati and CCCAOE to discuss research project to determine what TMC should be added/included on the list for upcoming TMC's.

Jonathan Lightman – Legislatures default to what they know. As a board we need to lead by example and lead them along by communicating with our legislature.

Beth Pratt – Several board members discussed aligning CTE and EWD. Senator Lu's office wants us to work collaboratively with the WIB's which presents its own challenges.  
Debra Jones – regarding regionalization and Perkins V, every state will determine its own region by sector and region. Regions must determine the industry sectors and partner with WIB's and industry partners.

VTQ –provides the Board of Governors CC's contribution to jobs and the economy. First, on import/export, second on healthcare. CC's were developed using a transfer model with little consideration for CTE or other vehicles for success. What is the first and second policy recommendation to the BOG?

Beth Pratt – WIB's timeline is much shorter than the cc's. Further, the for-profit training does not yield employment in such a short timeframe.

Best practices – Skill panels across regions or state; review Washington State and Pennsylvania for best practice model.

Debra Jones – regarding SB70 focus on regional economies.

Michael McGee – SB1070 – Steinberg interested in K12 and cc partnership. Bill will put legislative oversight on Chancellor's Office collaboration. Looking at articulation from junior high through CC's. Programs will have to choose to participate in the metrics process. 13-14 grants become competitive and regional.

Jeff Cumming - Integrative Planning is where the conversations and paradigm shifts occur. Is the Chancellor's Office having these integrative planning sessions? So, we're all on the same page and moving in the same direction? Wheeler North – bring the stakeholders together to create a short list.

VTQ – set up conference calls to strategize. What do we need to step up our game on SB70, CTE, & EWD?

Jeff Cumming – meet on Wednesday morning and Thursday evening to facilitate discussions regarding the four quadrants.

Action Item: VTQ Send to Rich Mabery the presentation for discussion tomorrow.

Action Item: John Means to invite a group to his room to discuss clarification of SB70 only.

John Means - Collect data regarding institutional research. Need to collect social security numbers.

VTQ – discussions with West Ed regarding pockets of data and how it's aggregated. Key to getting wage data is predicated on SS information. EDD needs to be at the table since it's an obstacle regarding data sharing and clarity.

John Means - lack of equity between CC's, CDE and Perkins.

Debra Jones – CA needs to revisit how the funds are distributed; Perkins ahead 3% for '12-'13.

Ron Selge – Perkins V needs to change the function of how to aggregate the data.

**CCCCIO – John Means \_ N/A**

**EWD – Ray York – N/A**

**EDPAC - Jeff Cummings**

**Academic Senate – Wheeler North –**

Academic Senate

*SSTF Recommendations – went to legislation – ASCCC Focus is:*

- *What can we do to implement – or, what are we already doing?*
- *District planning for math/Eng prerequisite implementation – guidelines now*



out Feb 2012

- Common assessment – still very early stages – part one will be infrastructure since the colleges currently cannot share data easily.

1440 Degrees/ TMC

Music TMC just approved – 7 of the 18 are in STEM/CTE and three of the four now being vetted are STEM/CTE

T5 regs on:

- E-materials changing – first read at BOG this week. Eliminates tangible property clause allowing e-materials to be required that do not have permanent ownership.
- Repetition repetition
- Repeatable courses vs. course repetition
- Three enrollments – max to be funded – guidelines available Oct 2011
- Repeatable courses to be limited significantly – there are other curricular options to accomplish goals

ASCCC Events upcoming:

- ASCCC will continue regional curriculum sessions
- Area Meetings March 31st – Area D Miramar College
- Plenary Session SFO Westin April 19-21
- Leadership Institute June 14-16 Temecula
- Curriculum Institute July 12-14 SFO Hyatt

#### **CCLC – Rick Ida**

##### **Regional Consortia – Lyla Eddington**

The Regional Consortium Chairs met at the Chancellor's Office on Monday January 23, 2012. The meeting attendees included the staff from the CCCCO. Meeting Agenda included the following:

1. Direction of Chancellor's Office related to "Doing What is Best for Jobs and the Economy"
2. Provided Feedback re model
3. Case Study: Education Fund for Health Care (SEIU).
4. Conversation regarding the expanded role the Regional Consortium could play in evolving into a regional infrastructure.
5. Plans for next several months.

The meeting also provided updates related to:

1. CTE Transition Grants
2. SB 70 Collaborative
3. Perkins reauthorization
4. CCCCO Staff attending regional meetings
5. Regional workshops for Counselors and Career Professionals
6. Workforce Leadership Institute

Next Meeting May 21, 2012

#### **Consultation – Hazel Hill**

On March 12<sup>th</sup> Hazel Hill participated in a meeting called by Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for the CCC-CO to discuss Instructional Agreements. After a day of conversation it became very clear that the process for Instructional Agreements is not very clear. There seems to be three major areas where confusion develops. The "Contract Guide for Instructional Service Agreements between College Districts and Public Agencies" was written in 1996 to address issues at three specific colleges. Since 1996 new legislation, laws and changes to the Education Code and Title 5 have approved that effect the sixteen items listed on the Contract Guide, but the sixteen items have not been updated to reflect the changes. The most interesting part of the conversation was hearing how each District interprets both the Guidelines and the effect of the newer rules and regulations.

Information collected during the meeting will be assembled and reviewed prior to any recommendations being made. During the meeting, which both John Means and Jeff Cummings attended, I recommended that this topic be considered for a breakout sessions during CCCAOE's Fall 1213 Conference. Barry Russell said he would be happy to participate in a breakout session.

CCCAOE is ready to start 2012 with all Board positions fill. It is very important that the Board start tagging folks for future position on the Board. When our slate of officers for 2012 -13 is announced on Thursday morning, it is very important to share with members of the organization the value and importance to serving on the Board of CCCAOE.

#### **Curriculum – Sid Burks - March 8, 2012**

Agenda Item	
	<p><b>Enrollment Priorities Workgroup Charter, Goals, and Timeframe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linda Michalowski presented the overview of the workgroup's purpose and goals (see enclosed).</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Student Success Task Force (SSTF) Recommendation 3.1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSTF recommendation frames the enrollment priority around four principles:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mission of transfer, AA/AS degrees, career preparation and advancement</li> <li>Protect access for students</li> <li>Student education goal and plan</li> <li>1<sup>st</sup> time student who completes metric core services of assessment, orientation, and ed plan</li> </ul> </li> <li>Highest priority for continuing students making academic progress towards their goal and meeting ed plan, includes career advancement and displaced workers</li> <li>New students who have fully matriculated, have an education goal and plan</li> <li>Priority to students who begin addressing basic skills needs in first year</li> <li>Existing priority enrollment for special populations currently in Ed Code and title 5 would remain intact.</li> <li>Students should lose enrollment priority if:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not making progress towards their ed plan; not making satisfactory academic progress (on progress probation)</li> <li>Accrue 100 units or more</li> </ul> </li> <li>Taskforce identified need to have exemptions and appeal process</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC: many components of the SSTF recommendation revolve around the student ed plan—what are the solutions or plans to make sure the CCC's have the capacity to require ed plans for all students. <i>LM: we cannot require students to do anything that we're not prepared to help them accomplish. We'll need to think through to what degree we can implement the various components of this recommendation and consider phase-in. We're working with the Counseling and Matriculation Advisory Committee to define terms and look at strategies.</i></li> <li>Linda Miskovic: It will be difficult to track whether students are meeting education plans—it requires a strong degree audit system. <i>LM: Envisions one system that is a student ed plan and degree audit system.</i></li> <li>RM: Problem with the CCC's is that community colleges are on different SIS systems—it would be a huge undertaking to developing a system-wide degree audit solution. Expects that it would be three year lag time to implement assuming you have all the resources in place.</li> <li>JH: Appreciates the complexity of a degree audit system—SCC is beginning to implement this at their college. Doesn't seem realistic to implement on a system-wide level. Following the ed plan, monitoring, and tracking will be a challenge.</li> <li><i>LM: Another issue is ensuring the colleges have the course capacity to make sure students have access to the course they need. VC Barry Russell is implementing SSTF 4.1.</i></li> <li>LR: We need to define what we mean by an education plan. <i>LM: The COAGC and MAC will look at terms and develop definitions.</i></li> <li>RL: We need to look at 30,000 foot viewpoint for definition of terms and let local colleges determine specifics. We need to look at student behaviors. His college has a degree audit program.</li> <li>RM: Challenge for CCC is that plans are similar to K-12 program plan—at CSU it's based on "credit summaries." Course availability is not an issue.</li> <li>RJ: Moving to a system that has less structure is counter to what much of the research and data has shown colleges need to move towards; the SSTF recommendation has many nuances we need to look at—example, career advancement is absolutely critical for the economy. Many students coming for just one class for career advancement and employment—we need to not disadvantage students like them through the enrollment priorities.</li> <li>BS: Chairs the TTAC—this committee is looking at the many projects that will enable this to happen and believes we are close to being able to do that—the technology is there. Implementation is another issue—the variety of basic skills courses and levels is one challenge. Research on student success—seeing a counselor does not improve retention or persistence—what does is having an education plan and having students follow an education plan. Maybe we can't do it now, but we've got to get on that path. Needs to be phase in overtime as resources and support are available.</li> <li>KB: need to define what is meant by "not following education plan." Concerned that we not be too prescriptive and not allow students to explore within reason; There seems to be a presumption that the displaced workers are already in the system—and that's not necessarily true. How new "displaced and incumbent workers" are students identified who come in for career advancement? How often will students be able to change their plan? When we talk about an appeal process, is that a hard appeal or a soft appeal? Is that a local concern or will there are state-level "hard" criteria? <i>LM: the letter is for the workgroup to discuss, that's not been determined yet. The SSTF did not talk about limits on how many times a student can change majors- that will be up for discussion and to determine local capacity.</i></li> <li>SB: Discussed 100 unit limit and impact.</li> <li>RM: Students tend not to follow ed plans—prefers credit summary approach; research shows that mandated enrollment in basic skills—English and math required early so that students have the foundation to be successful. Questions whether new high school graduates are actually competing with returning adult workers who come in for retraining or career advancement. Challenge with fact that college curriculum is not aligned even between colleges in multi-college districts, let alone system-wide.</li> <li>NL: attended Santa Monica College—was successful because he was required to complete orientation, assessment, and have an ed plan. Now, as a returning student, he would use the appeal process? Are there other incentives that are</li> </ul>

being addressed? *LM: Incentivizing student behaviors includes the priority enrollment, BOGFW, ensuring that student address basic skills early on.* NL: part of the student's problem is that students need to get the information they need—understand their responsibility.

**Agenda Item**

**Overview of Existing Enrollment Priorities in title 5 and Education Code**

Sonia Ortiz-Mercado provided a brief overview of existing Education Code and title 5 regulation enrollment priorities.

- Linda Miskovic: would like to make sure we change title 5 to clarify that EOPS and DSPS enrollment priorities are intended for students who are formally enrolled and participating in those programs.

**Review of Data to Inform Enrollment Priorities Discussion:**

Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry presented data on the student enrollments and behaviors:

- a. *90, versus 100, or 110 unit thresholds (2-10-12 memo "Displacement Analysis of Proposed SSTF Recommendations"):*
  - Since 2008-09, system dropped 292,000 in annual unduplicated headcount
  - New and special admit students dropped by 192,000—this is of concern when looking at enrollment management and pipeline of students
  - Peter Bahr study examined the student unit level and the likelihood that the student would earn a degree, certificate or transfer... 100 units was identified as the threshold in that study.
    - i. 36,000 students are at or above 100 unit threshold; examining student demographics, students who are at this threshold are more white and Asian. The summary memo did not filter by type of courses taken by the student. Using a threshold could free up room for new incoming students who currently are unable to enroll in a community college.
    - ii. The 74,240 avocational students are predominately white (49%), female (53%), and over the age of 50 (41%).
- b. *Summary of Selected Characteristics of Student Clusters*—study commissioned to identify who's in our system; tracked students over a 6 year period (FTS)—165,921 who generated 223,500 FTES
  - Examined student patterns and behaviors and identified 5 student clusters (groups) that students fall into, identified units taken, FTES generated, and outcomes (degree, transfer, certificate completion)
- c. *Recent Peter Bahr Study:*
- d. Completed study to examine how to increase student completions (efficiency)
- e. He found that students who earned more units in a semester more likely to get an award than a student who earns fewer units. Recommends prioritizing enrollment for students who earn more units in prior semester compared to others; please refer to study outcomes summary for additional details.

**Discussion:**

- How do colleges define "stop out"--- Linda Miskovic... a majority of colleges determine that if a student stops out one term, they come back as new students for enrollment priority; RM: depends on college SIS.
- KB: concerned about use of word "avocational"—need to come up with a better term. *LM, you can use the term "avocational student" but not for program or courses;* BS: another term to consider instead of avocational "non-mission appropriate students"

**Facilitated Discussion on Implementation Considerations:**

**On providing enrollment priority to new matriculated students with ed plans:**

- KS: West Hills created registration priority for new high school graduates two years ago—*LM: does that policy impact continuing students in good standing from getting courses?* KS: No negative impact determined; counselors and advisors on HS campuses—they help students get enrolled and complete ed plans on the HS campus.
- RM: At LBCC implementing this type of program this fall—to eliminate any competition between new and continuing students, as part of Long Beach College Promise, requiring that students take math and English in first year. Academic Affairs increased course offerings by 10% to mitigate impact on continuing students.
- TR: At Santa Monica College, in the past, priority for new students based on when they submitted application—changing to when new students complete matriculation process; over 90 units go last. If we don't help new students get classes that they need when they start, we're setting them up to fail. Need to start them off right to increase their chance of success.
- Linda Miskovic: At SCC provide enrollment priority to new high school graduates, SCC has a process for distributing student enrollments among course sections so that one course isn't primarily comprised of new HS graduates;
- NL: advised to take English and math early through matriculation process. Would like to see a transferrable "library research course" transcribed.
- RC: His district doesn't prioritize HS graduates—how we can better align and expand working with K-12 to get them to coordinate and work with local colleges—helps create some efficiency if we can serve/support

students before they come to college.

- BS: "Connect 4" program: apply to college, assess in place, financial aid, ed plan—if a student completes these 4 requirements—they get priority. If not, they can take a bridge course. Controversial at college because there are students who are not completing. The Connect 4 and Bridge cohort students do better.
- JF: need to focus on the research—perhaps survey colleges to find out what has been done and correlate data on student outcomes (to see if colleges are implementing aspects of 3.1)
- JF: seems like registration priority should already be aligned to what SSTF proposed. Need to look at impact on continuing students.
- KB: concerned that the system office would come out with directive that each college should provide enrollment priority to HS graduates—because that may not reflect local need (and high school populations).
- BS: Key elements are fully matriculated students... *LM—SSTF said continuing students in good standing in "mission" ed goal—*
- SB: conflict can be avoided—you don't necessarily need to break the contract with continuing students to priority enrollment to new students—can do both. SSTF envisioned this as a long term plan—this could be phased in. We have an immediate issue of enrollment capacity limitations—what can we do right now and what can we do later? 100 unit cap could be done now and maybe others, too...
- Linda Miskovic: WE could do 2 things that would help us be successful—reward students who are making satisfactory academic progress and (2)
- Ron Selge: SAM Code C—CTE focus—student coming in for one or two vocational courses shouldn't be blocked; SB: incumbent employees need to shore up skill set—take 1-3 classes and they're gone.
- BS: if we required that new students have to complete orientation, assessment, and advising for ed plans—that could give students priority.
- JH: looking at CCC survey, most colleges provide priority enrollment for various groups; we shouldn't assume that colleges aren't already doing this.

**On prioritizing enrollment for students who have an education goal consistent with CCC core mission of transfer, degree/certificate, or career advancement:**

- LM: identification of student goal—if we can't be funded to serve all students, we need to communicate that we're going to give priority to students whose goals are consistent with primary mission of CCC's: transfer, degree/certificate, career advancement
  - Why can't we do this—members expressed concern... KB: students will pick goal that helps them get priority—forcing bad data and then if colleges are held accountability through the scorecard for results—it actually encourages bad behavior.
  - ES: just because we're going to use this box being checked to prioritize who gets EP, for accountability system we look at student behavior—in ARCC we don't use student self-identified goal to identify if they're degree seeking... is there some other way to determine "goal"...
  - KB: look at self-identified goal along with enrollment behaviors—did they take math and English? Transfer level courses,
- BS: by 2<sup>nd</sup> semester student would have to have an informed student goal... goal upon entry and "informed" goal... help students to get in and get started and have a semester to receive counseling/advising
- JF: concerned that process would be prescriptive—force students into degrees.
- JH: what about undecided students? We don't have a way to deal with students who don't know what their goal is...
- KB: if we want to incentivize student behaviors—a student who only wants to take golf wouldn't want to go through assessment, orientation and develop an ed plan.
- KS: you're going to have those individuals who won't know what they want to do
- Rob: because students are undeclared doesn't mean they'll stay undeclared—they want to know what they have to do earn a degree....research from CCRC shows that students who concentrate are more likely to succeed than those who don't.

**GROUP CONSENSUS:**

- Workgroup members agreed that full implementation of all the SSTF priority enrollment elements is not feasible due to capacity constraints at this time, but that some elements could be ready for implementation through regulation this year.
- From the discussion, there was general consensus from members (12 agreed, 1 disagreed, 1 wanted grandfather period) that the unit cap and academic progress could be implemented.
- RC: because HS graduate EP seemed somewhat contentious... start by recognizing first time college students are important to prioritize—talk about how we provide access and develop capacity to provide matriculation services.
- BS: believes we can come to consensus on priority goal.

**What can we implement today:**

- Unit threshold 100 or 110 (majority agreed/one disagreed, one suggested grandfather period)
- New first time college students who complete core matriculation services (orientation, assessment, and counseling/advising to develop ed plans)



- Continuing students making satisfactory academic progress
- Mission priority goal of transfer, degree/certificate, career advancement

**Issues to Address:**

- How to identify and support undecided students
- Address using both self-identified goal and enrollment behavior to identify goal
- Ed plan might be a problem for short-term- are students who don't have an education plan ineligible for priority?
- BS: Matriculation requirements should apply to all students continuing and new
- TR: What's going to trump what? What's order of priority?
- NL: would like to consider grace period for students at 100 or 110 unit cap... perhaps an additional 25 units

**What student groups would be impacted?**

- JF: re-entry students would be impacted; if a student earned a BA already, and they want to start over on a new degree/career path would be impacted.

**Which student groups should be exempt and why?**

- SB: Exempt from what? LM: exempt from matrix? BS: exempt refers to matrix requirements.
- Apprenticeship, fire academies, students who are in "programs" RL: but if students in a program want to access courses to broader courses not in the program?
- What about students coming for one course only should not have to go through O/A/SEP
- Open course laws have criteria—
- BS—we should state that this does not apply to "programs" (Steve to develop language)
- BS: problem with students who end up enrolling in program courses just to get units to FA, but with no intention of earning program cert/degree. (aviation mechanics)

**Appeal Process Criteria:**

- LR: extenuating circumstance criteria for students who fall into academic/progress probation due to a significant extenuating circumstance (i.e., death in the family, significant workplace issue).
- General appeal: extenuating circumstance, workplace issue,
- KB: Hard appeal or soft appeal?
- SB: Identify criteria
- RS: status—if a worker who had to stop out because of work for a semester... could they come back as a continuing student, not a new student
- JF: if there's a hard appeal—students will leave. Tendency that will happen that students will leave if they encounter an obstacle—consider soft appeal then a hard appeal. LM: this gets to the hard issues that the SSTF was trying to deal with—help students overcome obstacles, achieve goal, and move on to make room for other students. It's about cultural change. JB: this wouldn't preclude college from implementing interventions to "intervene" before a student "stops out" or has to reach an appeal because of academic/progress probation.
- RS: STEM students often accumulate a lot of units..
- JH: if we try to identify every possible appeal, we'll never catch them all... the issue should be that the college has an appeal process...
- KB: give the institution a little leeway—provide some criteria/groups for appeal, like extenuating circumstance, and then let local districts determine other categories.

**How would students lose enrollment priority?**

- LM: Group identified two for short-term implementation: unit cap and SAP
- SB: students who don't address basic skills in first year lose enrollment priority
- Linda Miskovic: this should be a long-term implementation goal--- how would we track that?
- RL: Concern about lack of course offerings—not enough basic skills courses for all students to take English and math in first year. We should aim for that—it would be a good thing. But, because of budget constraints, colleges can't do that now.
- ES: The SSTF was clear that addressing basic skills was not just through courses but other activities, like tutoring, student success course, etc.

**Implementation Timeline (estimates)**

Short-term, phased-in implementation:

1. May BOG
2. July BOG
3. Summer 2013 date effective implementation

**Next Meeting Dates:**

- Wednesday, March 21, 2012: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
- Wednesday, April 4, 2012: 10:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

**Action Items:**

- Create a "CCC-Enrollment Priorities" listserv for members to communicate about SSTF recommendation 3.1, implementation considerations, and draft regulatory language.
- Develop and release a survey on various provisions to be addressed in the draft regulatory proposal.
- Chancellor's Office to draft regulatory proposal based on provisions of SSTF recommendation 3.1 (where members had general consensus) for review and input for the next meeting.
- Board to create a long term plan – we see unemployment as the primary driver of CTE in cc and the next generation of worker.
- VTQ asking us to identify the gaps in law, policy, practices, data, etc.
- What is the difference between regions and sectors? Sectors = industry...Region=territory
- VTQ – Create a matrix between regions or sectors.
- CCCAOE need to work jointly with Steinberg's Office, Chancellor's Office regarding is needed for SB70 language. Create a rough draft regarding concerns and successes for SB70 and present to Senator Liu and Steinberg's Office. Want to know how it aligns with LAO, and Legislature.
- Work within the regions to align ourselves using the four quadrants outlined by VTQ regarding SB70. Where do we fit into the structure? What can we do to meet the need?

58108. Registration and Enrollment Procedures.

"(a) Procedures for registration and standards for enrollment in any course shall be only those which are consistent with these and other sections of Title 5 and uniformly administered by appropriately authorized employees of the district.

(b) Registration priority shall be provided to students who are:

1. identified in state law for registration priority and who meet the requirements of law;
2. participating in the Disabled Student Program and Services and Extended Opportunity Program and Services who have completed orientation, assessment, and developed student education plans and who meet specific program criteria for participation;
3. continuing students who are not on their second consecutive term of academic or progress probation as defined in 55031; and,
4. first time students who have completed orientation, assessment, and developed student education plans.

(c) Notwithstanding the requirements and conditions for registration priority for special student populations identified in state law, all other continuing students shall lose registration priority if:

1. the student is placed on academic or progress probation as defined in 55031 for two consecutive terms; or
2. the student has accrued 100 or more credit units, not including credits earned for basic skills or English as a Second Language courses.

(d) Except as otherwise provided by state law, no student shall be required to confer or consult with or be required to receive permission to enroll in any class from any person other than those employed by the college in the district.

(e) Students will not be required to participate in any preregistration activity not uniformly required; nor shall the college or district allow anyone to place or enforce nonacademic requisites as barriers to enrollment in or the successful completion of a class.

(f) No registration procedures shall be used that result in restricting enrollment to a specialized clientele.

(g) Each community college district shall establish written procedures by which a student may challenge the loss of priority enrollment status based on the provisions of this chapter. Such procedures may be consolidated with existing student grievance procedures by action of the governing board. Appeal may be granted if the district finds that the conditions that caused the loss of registration priority status were the result of extenuating circumstances beyond the student's control or would cause the student undue hardship.

(h) In addition to the state mandated registration proprieties identified in 58108(b) the following registration procedures are permissible: special registration assistance to the handicapped or disadvantaged student as defined by statute, for the purpose of providing equalization of educational opportunity; and districts are permitted to establish registration procedures for the enrollment of students in accordance with a priority system established adopted pursuant to legal authority by the local board of trustees.

(i) With respect to accessibility to off-campus sites and facilities, no student is to be required to make any special effort not required of all students to register in any class or course section. Once enrolled in the class, all students must have equal access to the site.

**NCWE – Nick Kremer**

The National Council of Workforce Education has continued its two year effort to professionalize and increase its national presence. It is now managed by its own executive director rather than an organizational management group. The current President, William Gary, of Northern Virginia Community College, has put an active committee structure into place. The website (NCWE.org) has been upgraded to include more content and offer social media tools for the members to



communicate with each other. Key sections of the website are no longer password protected. For example the resource section is a rich repository of recent workforce related studies and can now be accessed by non-members. NCWE has continued to be a part of significant national projects such as Accelerating Opportunity and Breaking Through--Tribal Colleges. It is currently seeking partnerships with colleges/coalitions that are pursuing TAA funds.

The 2012 NCWE conference will be held in Long Beach on October 20th to the 23rd. An effort was made in 2010 to plan at least part of the conference to overlap and link with CCCAOE (October 17, 18, and 19) but NCWE was unable to alter its contract with the Hyatt Regency.

#### **Perkins Research & Accountability – Corine Doughty/Nick Kremer**

Van Ton-Quinlivan – we have 6 months to redefine accountability measures. Identify what gets collected and measured; completion and success matters when defining the criteria

##### 4 Skill Sets:

1. Data Mining – LMI data
2. Convening/Collaboration/Integration
3. Technology/Technical Assistance...who is it?
4. Curriculum Approval
  - a. Shorten the approval time
  - b. Lyla Eddington and the Academic Senate are working together on a process

Skills Panel – businesses define the skill sets required for program/course development. Career Readiness Assessment is being shelved/tabled per VTQ.

Goal: To help colleges connect CTE to non-CTE

Inside Higher Education article discussed Core Metrics including:

1. Common Metrics must be incorporated by 2012 and should include:
  - a. Core Measures – do we include non-credit and EWD in the measures? Solicit EWD and non-credit reps to determine the measure?
  - b. Student Success Task Force (SSTF) must include a data mix of metrics and scorecard (what is the scorecard?) How will it be defined and measured?
    - a. Define what is success?
    - b. Why does a student have to complete his program at college X if college Y has the course(s) needed to be a completer/leaver. Can't both colleges get credit???
2. Perkins – Performance Based Funding for the 2012 reauthorization
  - a. As an advisory we need an action plan with priorities
  - b. CCCAOE Advocate in D.C. uses Jonathan Lightman to assist with pushing the agenda?
3. Jobs & The Economy – What's compass used to measure, justify programs and expansion?
  - a. Consider [www.webdata2.cccco.edu/eddui/eddui/cfm](http://www.webdata2.cccco.edu/eddui/eddui/cfm)
  - b. Consider mapping highest concentration of CTE programs in CA for determining who is the college or region best positioned to meet the needs of the CA economy, not just local. It cuts down on destructive competition and allows for signature programs at certain colleges.

Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges – report used for legislatures to determine CC Success. It's not representative of the cc success as the data is flawed. What are the common metrics to be examined and how do we ensure accuracy of data?

Talking Points for Next Meeting:

1. Should we be collecting SS#'s at all the CA CC's to determine successful leavers/completers and employment?



2. How do we identify CTE students?
3. What is the concept of a scorecard? What is it?
4. What are the program outcomes?
5. Employment/Earnings & Retention of jobs...how do we define and measure success?
  - a. Do we look at leavers/completers
  - b. Do we leave the course completion?
  - c. How do we collect data? We're already collecting data. We don't need additional resources; we just need to define the metrics.
  - d. Do we include EWD and non-credit? I would ask them to present at the next meeting a set of criteria for definition
  - e. Look at state licensing data & cohorts for success.
  - f. Do we look at program success or individual student success or both?

**Legislative Update – Jonathan Lightman**

With the Legislature returning to work, focus has been on communicating the need to support CTE and EWD in the California Community Colleges.

**Legislation**

We have worked closely with Senator Ted Lieu (D – Redondo Beach) and the Chancellor's Office on [SB 1402](#), the reauthorization of the California Community Colleges Economic and Workforce Development Program. Senator Lieu is pleased to welcome the input and co-sponsorship of CCCAOE as this measure moves forward in the legislative process.

Other measures worth noting include:

[AB 2647 \(Swanson\)](#), spot bill on CTE. The author's office has indicated that the bill may be used for a different purpose.

[SB 1401 \(Lieu\)](#), creating the California Industry Sector Initiative to align and leverage state and local Workforce Investment Act funding streams, identify specified industry sectors and clusters, provide skills-gap analysis, and establish specified eligibility criteria for the Workforce Investment Act eligible training provider list.

[SB 1456 \(Lowenthal\)](#), creates the Student Success Act of 2012, implementing the major recommendations of the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) on Matriculation and changes to Board of Governors' fee waiver policies.

[SB 1550 \(Wright\)](#), allowing districts to create CTE "extension" courses in which the full cost of instruction is passed onto students.

[Backfill of Mid-Year "February Surprise"](#). Although there are not yet any bills on this subject, it has become the overwhelming topic in the community college system. In February, the System was informed that property tax and student fee revenues was \$149 million below projection. Combined with the anticipated \$30 million in Tier 1 trigger cuts, community colleges may lose \$179 million in the mid-year. Legislative leaders and Administration officials are continuing to discuss ways to keep the System's budget whole for 2011-12 through some form of restoration.

[Community College to Career Fund](#) (federal). President Obama has proposed an \$8 billion fund to support community college-based training programs that will expand targeted training to meet employer needs in growth and demand sectors, provide workers with the latest certified training, and invest in registered apprenticeships and other on-the-job training opportunities. The Fund will also support paid internships for low-income community college students to allow them to simultaneously earn credit for work-based learning and gain relevant employment experience in high-wage, high-skill fields. States will also be able to seek funding to support employer efforts to upgrade workforce skills.

**CCCAOE Day in Sacramento**

On February 13, FACCC organized a day in Sacramento for CCCAOE, for meeting with:

**DISCUSSION**



- Legislative Analyst’s Office
- Office of Susan Bonilla, Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education
- Office of Senator Loni Hancock, Member, Senate Education Committee
- Office of Senator Ted Lieu, Chair, Senate Labor and Industrial Relations Committee
- Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg
- Senate Republican Office of Policy
- Office of Assembly member Connie Conway, Assembly Republican Leader
- Office of Assembly member Warren Furitani, Chair, Community College Caucus and Select Committee on CTE

The recurring message from Capitol staff to CCCAOE was that it is necessary for the CTE community to provide not just a response to the SSTF, but to pursue its own analysis and set of recommendations.

Driven by discussions on the SSTF, an outcome of the CCCAOE Day in Sacramento is a request by Assembly member Furitani to Assembly Speaker Pérez to hold an informational hearing on the issues that surround student success for CTE students. It is anticipated that formal approval for a hearing will be announced in the near future and CCCAOE will be called upon to offer advice in the development of the agenda and to provide expert testimony. By all accounts, this was a highly successful day with significant conversation throughout. We strongly recommend calendaring the next CCCAOE Day in Sacramento.

**Budget**

As reported in the last activity update, Governor Brown released his January budget proposal on January 5, five days ahead of schedule. Major adjustments to the budget include the following:

**Apportionments**—An increase of \$218.3 million in 2012–13 to partially restore funding that had been previously deferred, contingent upon the passage of the Governor’s tax initiative. This restoration will reduce the debt burden of the state and is consistent with, and proportional to, the restoration of funding in K–12 education.

**Categorical Program Consolidations and Flexibility**—Currently, colleges have many overlapping limitations on how they spend their funds and are not able to direct their scarce resources based on what is needed locally to achieve student success. They are limited as to the populations of students that they may serve and programs they may offer. The Budget proposes to consolidate nearly all categorical programs and provide flexibility to CCC to use “flexed” funds for any categorical program purpose. This proposal will improve student access and success and will provide the colleges with more local control, flexibility, and decision-making authority. The Administration will review the recommendations of the forthcoming Student Success Task Force report and explore other possibilities for expanding flexibility—including fee policy changes and loosening operational restrictions—for inclusion in the May Revision.

**Mandate Reform**—The Budget proposes to preserve core mandatory programs and functions, to eliminate unnecessary mandates, and to create a mandates block grant incentive program. The details of this proposal are consistent with the K–12 Education mandate reform proposal discussed in the K–12 Education section.

**Redevelopment Agency Elimination**—The Budget includes a current year Proposition 98 General Fund reduction of \$146.9 million to CCC apportionments to reflect an identical increase in offsetting property taxes resulting from the elimination of redevelopment agencies.

**Changes to Cal Grant Eligibility**—The Budget proposed to limit Cal Grant eligibility by raising the minimum grade point average criteria for students entering out of high school and for community college transfers to four-year universities. Under the Governor’s plan, the minimum GPA for high school entitlement Cal Grant B would be raised from 2.0 to 2.75; for community college transfer students receiving Cal Grant A awards, the minimum GPA would rise from 2.4 to 2.75; for community college transfer students receiving Cal Grant B awards, the minimum GPA would be raised from 2.4 to 2.75.

On March 5, the Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education Finance rejected the Administration’s proposed changes to minimum GPA for Cal Grant awards. This issue has yet to be heard in the Senate.

**DISCUSSION**

Hazel Hill – legislative advocacy day where John Means, Beth Pratt, Jeff Cummings, Hazel Hill and Andrea York met with legislatures. Need to get organized and present the facts regarding need, funding, etc.

Beth Pratt – need the facts, provide and find data.

Jeff Cummings – legislatures don’t understand what happens on our campuses; they want to



know what the issues are and how it relates to their causes. Need to get them to our campuses.

John Means – challenge to get to the Chancellor’s Office yet it’s critical to our future success.

Jonathan Lightman – biggest outcomes were SSTF and CTE. Commend the written correspondence on the report. Bottom line – it’s an on-going conversation and if we’re serious we must host the conversation. The conference can be the spot. Legislatures should be invited and encouraged to participate in the conversation. Senator Warren Furitani wants to know how to bring it to the CTE Select Committee hearing. It appears there will be a hearing and CCCAOE will be featured. John Means or a representative will present and need additional members/representatives during the public comment. Members should say that they are a member of CCCAOE and a member of the regional consortium. WE can tie CTE, EWD and regionalization together. The problem is tying the data together. Need to select another day closer to the May revise.

FACCC – all bills available for review on the FACCC website regarding community college.

One bill of importance is SB1550 – Santa Monica College and College of the Canyons teamed up to sponsor SB1550. It would have allowed any district to say if we have student demand beyond our capability and charge full fare for a credit class. It passed the Assembly with difficulty and was not voted on by the Senate. Long Beach CC introduced a similar bill but relative to CTE. If we have a greater demand for CTE we can label them as extension. Santa Monica College’s board created a non-profit for extension courses and charging full price. Chancellor’s Office considering legal ramifications. If there was something pressing that we wanted to do regarding the above bill, there is a short window to “gut and amend” the language.

Sid Burks – proliferations of profit schools taking the funds for students we can’t serve. Why wouldn’t we participate in the opportunity?

Jonathan’s conversation with LBCC’s President involved an industry cluster needing training, could business make an investment in the future workforce demand/student?

Michael McGee – Overview summary regarding EWD reauthorization changes. Any changes must include a solid rationalization. You don’t want to make such substantive changes that it impedes the reauthorization. Is the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development a partner intra-governmentally or is it an expectation?

VTQ – Where do our students come from? What is the student came from the WIB? How will the data transfer over? If we have a robust online system, we can get them processed expeditiously and reduce duplication. If it’s a high school student, can we assist them while still in high school so they don’t have to repeat the process? How as a system would we accept the WIB and ROP’s assessment?

Jeff Cummings – why can’t we have one system for students that is integrated throughout the K12, WIB and community college would be more effective and efficient if funding permits. It’s about integrating all the systems in more simplified ways to help students succeed.

Ron Selge – implementation discussions. Several items we could deal with. One recommendation 3.1 Enrollment Priorities are currently meeting and deliberating. They have articulated that students need to express a goal. For first time students they must have an orientation experience including assessment and Ed planning. Certain SAM Code courses might not require enrollment priority. Second, if the continuing students are on academic probation it would require intervention. Third, course selection piece (4.1) Course availability is predicated on students Program of Study or the course availability should include LMID. Fourth piece can be handled institutionally regarding the student success score card. It is going to be integrated into the ARCC 2 report. VRATEC is making the recommendations to the Chancellor’s Office regarding success.

Student Services Sub-Committee acknowledges that counseling will be a priority for the SSTF. Group has been augmented to include Omid Pourzanjani.

VTQ – What are we asking? Can only counselors do counseling? Recommendations include:



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Integrating technology to tie all the systems together.</li> <li>2. Have students make decisions regarding Ed planning using technology</li> <li>3. Offer classes for student success</li> <li>4. Do we have data to reflect the above best practices? Does it work?</li> <li>5. Show where it's working and where students are going?</li> <li>6. CIO's are the greatest asset in moving technology forward</li> </ol> <p>Sid Burks – Challenges with the Enrollment Priorities Group included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the definition of an Ed Plan</li> <li>2. Members ill-prepared to address the issues.</li> <li>3. Pushing the responsibility off on work groups that have not been created/formed.</li> <li>4. How do you address the issues when there is such division between the constituencies?</li> </ol> <p>Question: What will happen with the information generated from the workgroups? Will it be distributed to the groups? Eric Skinner can answer the question.</p> <p>CCCAOE is poised to represent the group on ARCC, Student Success and Enrollment Management.</p>		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<p>Schedule a Webinar with Ray York, Jonathan Lightman and CCCAOE Board to discuss the EWD reauthorization.</p> <p>Send out an e-blast to the membership on SB1402 and EWD reauthorization analysis and include the codes. Ask the board for comments, questions or action by a specific date. If changes are proposed please ensure they include a solid rationalization. Jonathan will include a link on the FACCC website.</p> <p>Discuss with Chancellor's Office regarding governmental partnerships.</p> <p>Take to the legislature the following statement: "On behalf of CCCAOE the Career Counseling must be an integral component based on the legislatures report that it did not represent CTE."</p> <p>Conference call with Jonathan Lightman, Eric Skinner, Omid Pourzanjani, Nick Kremer, Sid Burks and John Means before the Furitani hearing.</p> <p>John Means to recruit individuals to present at the hearing.</p> <p>Review the CTE TMC's to ensure accuracy.</p> <p>Develop a common definition for what we want out of ARCC. There are opportunities to advance the conversation with CTE.</p> <p>Work with NCWE to review their vendors list in an effort to recruit for CCCAOE?</p> <p>Identify hotels for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014.</p>	<p>Executive Committee</p> <p>Rich Mabery</p> <p>Jonathan Lightman</p> <p>Executive Committee</p> <p>John Means and Board</p> <p>John Means</p> <p>Kim Schenk/Wheeler North</p> <p>Executive Committee</p> <p>Rich Mabery</p>	



--	--	--

**Review of Action Items/Secretary Recap**

CORINE DOUGHTY

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Hazel Hill - Board Elections</b>                  Jeff Cummings –V.P. Elect                  Eva Jimenez – Regional V.P. North/Far North Dean, Bus, Ag, Indus &amp; Tech.                  Carole Goldsmith – Regional V.P. re-elected                  Mollie Smith/ Jonathon Kropp – Regional V.P.                  Joyce Johnson – Desert Region Regional V.P.                  Beth Pratt – Treasurer – re-elected</p> <p><b>Upcoming Conferences</b>                  Diversity Conference on April 27<sup>th</sup> at El Camino College                  California Great Teachers Conference held in Santa Barbara yearly in the summer. Great resource for faculty to attend. Information available</p>
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS SEE ABOVE IN RED	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Next Meeting March 22, 2011	All	N/A

**Meeting Adjourn**

TIME: 4:10 PM