



**South Central Coast Regional Consortium (SCCRC)
MINUTES
September 22, 2017
Pierpont Inn**

Welcome and Introductions

Luann/Diane

Attendees

Name	Position	College, Host College, or Organization
Rees, Mary	Dean	Moorpark College
Chavez, Holly	DSN, Ag, Water, Env. Technology	Allan Hancock
Lau, Margaret	Dean	Allan Hancock
Ward, Nancy Jo	Faculty—CTE Liaison	Allan Hancock
Marshall, Renee	Teacher Prep Lead	College of the Canyons
Miles, Karen	K14 Career Pathways TAP	College of the Canyons
Swanberg, Luann	SCCRC Chair	Santa Barbara City College
Hollems, Diane	SCCRC Co-Chair	Santa Barbara City College
Duffy, Patricia	Ventura WDB	Ventura County WDB
Teasdale, Dave	Prop 39 Director	Bakersfield College
Hodge, Paula	DSN, ICT/DM	College of the Canyons
Happel, Harriet	Director, CTE	College of the Canyons
Suderman, Bonnie	CIO	Antelope Valley College
Flores, Laureano	Dean	Antelope Valley College
Cabral, Marcelo	Faculty-CTE Liaison	Oxnard College
Park, Celine	Grant Director	Moorpark College
Newcomb, Debbie	Dean	Ventura College
Duenas, Felicia	Dean	Ventura College
Lake, Amanda	SCCRC Assistant	Santa Barbara City College
Cascamo, John	Dean	Cuesta College
Jurevich, Gayla	DSN, Small Business	Cuesta College
Carlson, Kevin	Research Analyst	Moorpark College
Hall, Deanna	Faculty—CTE Liaison	Ventura College
Quire, Gary	Faculty—CTE Liaison	Moorpark College
Tafoya, Christina	Dean	Oxnard College
Wright, Alex	Economic & Workforce Dev Director	Ventura CCC District
Blasberg, Regina	Faculty—CTE Liaison	College of the Canyons
Samson, Julie	DSN—Global Trade & Logistics	Santa Barbara City College
Putnam, Lisa	CIO	Oxnard College (via Zoom)

August Minutes M/S/A

Luann Swanberg

Chancellor’s Office Report

Written report submitted, handout provided, and emailed to Deans and DSNs



Doing What MATTERS for Jobs and the Economy, California Community Colleges
doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu

www.sccrcolleges.org



CCCAOE Report

Julius/Robert

- Robert emailed his report. **Leadership Academy** builds the core knowledge, skills, and networking essential to CTE and EWD professionals. Summer 2017- Was held in Sacramento, June 13-16 2017, included 43 participants with faculty, administrators, and staff in participation. Summer 2018- Embassy Suites, June 5-8 2018 (SAVE THE DATE) o Small co-hort, usually approx.. 50 attendees, and all modules are being revised for next summer.
- **More & Better CTE Regional Forums-** Primary audience are those that need an intro to the DWM framework, an intro to the SWP funding models, roles of SNs and DSNs, and CTE Data Unlocked. Audience: CIOs, Faculty & AS Reps, Deans, CSSOs, and others.

--10 forums were held in the Spring & Summer --13 future forums scheduled Sept-Nov at various colleges around the state. --No cost to attend --For information on dates/times and to register, visit our website under the More & Better CTE Tab.

- **Conference- GPS (Guiding Pathways to a Strong Workforce)** --Registration is open. Dates: November 1-3 at the Omni Resort in Palm Desert --Pre-conference sessions begin the morning of 11/1 at 8am- and include a choice of EDGAR, Project Management, and Apprenticeships. --The conference begins at 11:30 on 11/1, and closes 11:30 on Friday 11/3. --Session proposals are due 9/21. --We have nearly 300 people registered. Please join us as we collectively discuss the Community College Vision, Guided Pathways, and other initiatives while using a compass of workforce and economic development

Regional Chairs Report

Luann Swanberg

Luann asked if colleges got an email regarding the NOVA permissions. There is a google doc listing permissions for round one re: individuals at colleges and regions authorized to make changes to the project docs. Luann will send a clarifying email to the CTE deans. NOVA is the online system for both local and regional shares. October 2nd is the release date for reporting.

Luann mentioned that Ventura College will get a “member at large” for the remainder of this year on the Steering Committee. At the January 2018 retreat meeting we will discuss creating detailed By-Laws for the Steering Committee.

Report Outs

Dave Teasdale sent a report, but made announcements regarding his handout. He would like colleges to report TOP codes and completers to him. This has increased his funding significantly.

Gayla reported that she has funds set aside for the GIG economy meeting.

Julie reported that on October 27th there will be a Global for Manufacturing event in Santa Barbara. She has been working with the Department of Commerce to identify needs in our region. October 16th there will be an online course to prep for the CGPP exam.





Holly will be rolling out high school mini grants. There are interns being hired in Palmdale subsidized by DSN funds. We will put discussion of apprenticeships on the agenda for a future meeting.

Karen has been meeting with various school districts re: the GFSF follow-up modules and talking to colleges about incoming students. She's been asking about counseling summits and will fund. She's been doing teacher training on articulation in Ventura County. There will be an articulation event. In Ventura County there has been much discussion re: dual enrollment vs. articulation. Upcoming Best Practices CTE teacher trainings on 9/29 at Moorpark, 10/9 at Cuesta, 10/26 at COC. High school teachers can attend as well. Margaret requested that the Student Success workshops be condensed into one day, and Karen is working on it.

Center of Excellence

Mary Rees

Interviews will be held in October and Mary hopes the new person will be attending CCCAOE. There will be a 3-person team that will include Kevin Carlson and Admin. Assistant, Gaby.

New Programs

Mary Rees

Moorpark College

- Hospitality Management
- Registered Behavior Technician Proficiency Award which qualifies someone to work with autistic children
- Transitional Kindergarten Certificate of Achievement

Renee offered to promote Transitional Kindergarten at College of the Canyons. Margaret asked that about the Hospitality Management and whether there will be a Math course. Gary responded that there will be and it was just left off the paperwork handed out. Gary reported that they are partnering with Cal State Northridge. John Cascamo asked if the new Hospitality program would detract from their general business program. Gary shared that they would be working with people already in industry ready to be promoted. The program will be launched as online.

Regional Vote for all 3 Moorpark programs:

Cuesta -	yes
Allan Hancock -	yes
SBCC -	absent
Ventura-	yes
Oxnard -	no for Hospitality and yes for the other two. Christina shared that there will be duplication of courses with Oxnard College because they have had Hospitality Management track.
Moorpark -	yes
COC -	yes
AVC -	yes

Presentation of the SWP Rubric

Alex Wright & Harriet Happel

Handouts were presented. Harriet shared that the rubrics are +/- and that the expectation from the state is that wants us to integrate with other agencies such as WIOA and AEBGs. She encouraged us to consider the complexity of the rubric in order to determine effectiveness.

Table Discussion Report Outs

Table discussion questions were presented on the agenda:





1. What to use the tool for (planning, evaluation, recommendations) and when should it be implemented.
2. How does the draft tool (handout) work for the above
3. Do we need additional tools?
4. Are there any other recommendations, considerations or concerns about the tool and how to use it.

Back table #1—rubric doesn't apply to 2016-17 funds—just for new projects. Rubric would be presented by the person presenting the project. You're "selling" your project based on the rubric. Acts like a checklist. Once projects are presented, they can be shown in a bar chart. The longer tool not appropriate for next month.

Left Table (from front) #2—Agree with table 1. Think it fits better for next year. Good planning tool for looking at new projects. Concerned about weighting issues. What is good for the region needs to be the driver. Agreed we need a rubric for October—maybe use the same kind of rubric used for Local Share, including measuring with one of the SWP outcomes. The Steering committee could use the same. The short document is dissimilar to today's handout and could be used for updating the SWP plan. The four basic elements are: Supply/Demand, what SWP, outcome(s) will be measured and target timelines, is there a regional value, partners and budget.

Right table (from front) #3—In regard to the longer form, perhaps it should apply to projects more than \$200,000. Would be good to use the form as "proof of concept." Helpful tool for departments who would like SWP funding. This would be difficult for small departments. Good for educating leaders as to what the funding is intended for. Is this overkill? Great tool to guide the consortium. Recommend someone to use the tool in constructing a proposal to see about the timing it takes to complete (pilot it).

Front table #4—October 20th might be too soon to use today's handout. If we're only judging regional projects, we should simplify and use regional goals. Academic Senate wants to be more a part in the process of decision-making.

General Discussion

Use as a guideline for planning and not for October 20 proposals.

Action Steps

Alex emailed the rubrics presented at today's meeting. Diane will combine some elements and then send to everyone for comment.

We will decide whether to use the "combined" form for the October 20th proposal showcase.

SEE THE NEXT PAGE FOR EMAIL EXCHANGE BETWEEN DIANE AND MATT ROBERTS REGARDING CLARIFYING LANGUAGE ABOUT SWP. MATT'S EMAIL RESPONSE WAS ALSO FORWARDED TO ALL OF THE CTE DEANS IN THE REIGON.





From: Diane Hollems [mailto:diane.hollems@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2017 10:32 AM
To: Roberts, Matthew <mroberts@CCCCO.edu>
Cc: Luann Swanberg <lswanberg2@gmail.com>; John Cascamo <john_cascamo@cuesta.edu>
Subject: Clarifying language about SWP

Hi Matt,

We're at our regional meeting today, and a question came up about what SWP funds really are.

For example, are the funds "categorical" or are they "enhanced apportionment" or are they a "grant."

Following is one way to describe. Let us know if this is accurate and, if not, what is the proper definition:

"Strong Workforce Program funding is categorical through enhanced apportionment. This means that the funding must be approved in the Governor's budget each year. It is not a typical grant with a face sheet. SWP funds have specific reporting and outcome metrics."

Thanks for clarifying.

Di

From: Roberts, Matthew <mroberts@cccco.edu>
Date: Fri, Sep 22, 2017 at 10:55 AM
Subject: RE: Clarifying language about SWP
To: Diane Hollems <diane.hollems@gmail.com>
Cc: Luann Swanberg <lswanberg2@gmail.com>, John Cascamo <john_cascamo@cuesta.edu>

It's considered a categorical that flows through the apportionment schedules for the districts. Being a categorical, yes it does need to be approved every year, but is considered an ongoing expenditure from the legislature. Being a categorical also has implications for labor negotiations. As superintendent, I would never use categorical funds for teacher/staff raises. So, a district can have a greater opportunity to shield the funding from the collective bargaining process. For employment, we recommended the 70/30 rule because it's a categorical. No more than 70% of a personnel expenditure should come from this categorical.

Let me know if you have additional questions.

Matt-

