

Minutes

SWAC meeting 2/1/19

10 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

AC 229 – Conference Room

- Review Agenda
- Minutes from 1/25/19
- Application Review
- Review Strong Workforce metrics
- Applications
- Meeting Wrap Up/Next Steps

Attending: Mark Barrall, Kilia Pasco, Alex Jones, Will Coley, Cari Torres, Katheryn Horton, Mike Cairns, Cheo Massion, Melanie Palomono

Katheryn Horton started the meeting with introductions. This session was slated as a working session. First, the committee reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Katheryn suggested we go through applications together and discuss during the meeting time, then the scoring would be a group score instead of individual scoring.

The committee brought up a number of points: Group review may eliminate individual points of view. Everyone will have their own point of view, and some will be thinking about budget cutting. Will Coley asked, are we putting money on actual programs that have "legs"? If a program would be slated to be reduced by PRAC, why would Strong Workforce (SW) funds be contributed to those programs? Another viewpoint is that the SW funds can revitalize or strengthen a program that is currently weak, hence the purpose of Strong Workforce funding. Other examples come up about the value of programs including what the students are achieving once finishing programs such as Court Reporting and Real Estate.

If a COM program has a low completion and success rate in a program, why do we want to give money to a program? The point is the committee members will have different biases and viewpoints. We probably will not have a consensus in the numbers, and we should embrace this. The committee decided individual reviews were a more appropriate way to conduct the review.

Katheryn asked about the current agenda and how to better adjust. She suggested instead of spending on 10 minutes per application, maybe every ½ hour the committee could break and recheck where we are in time and progress. The committee agreed.

Katheryn asked if the minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and if there were any changes needed. The minutes from last meeting were approved.

For the rubric, Mark explained that he took his experience from different scoring systems he put together in the past from academics and sports. He explained he tried to make the scoring easier for evaluations. The committee didn't propose an alternative scoring method.

The committee stated they have access to the shared drive folder. The shared folder includes the application and researched labor market information (LMI) for each. Katheryn explained that one purpose Heather Rahman was attending the meeting was to act as a resource for any LMI questions or concerns. The committee took time to read through the applications and to contemplate the content individually.

After 45 minutes or so in review, Katheryn proposed since everyone was reviewing the applications in order, the committee could discuss maybe 3 applications to change up the energy in the meeting a bit. The committee agreed, and they continued to finish up the application they were reading at that time.

The committee decided to discuss which applications to review together in order to be aware of the different thoughts each committee member has in the review. Mark Barrall suggest we have a 'blind' way of putting scores into a spreadsheet, so that the committee can see how the scores are weighing without knowing who scores what.

Alex Jones asked if the goal of the committee at this meeting was to review, get a grasp of the rubric and to formulate questions about the applications, but wait to score upon the presentation? Katheryn stated that if the application isn't good enough by the committee consensus and will not be approved, then the committee won't need them to present. However, for the other applications we will ask them to give a brief presentation about their request for funding. That will be the next step.

Upon reviewing the Auto Estimator application, questions came up about in general what the value was in introducing damage estimation into the program. Cari pointed out the application is confusing regarding if the program was addressed by an advisory committee versus what is included in the application. Would industry people enroll to learn auto estimation, and what value would it offer to them? Mark explained it would help workers to move up in what they can do at the companies they work for. Around the table members stated what they scored and some stated why.

Katheryn asked the committee if she knows more about the project and program, does the committee want her input to add context? The committee agreed. Katheryn explained the origin of thought behind the Auto Estimator application, and the essence isn't described really well into the app. The concept was to offer a short, skills certificate that could possibly help women get higher wage employment. Also, through the Career and Technical Education department, this program could be looked at as a possible Adult Education program and receive funding through other means.

Heather Rahman explained the challenges in finding labor market information targeting information for advanced technology in vehicles due to the way the information is grouped into the State Occupational Codes (SOC). So, some information was pulled for job posting. You can see some information to show wages, but it is still hard to distinguish how much more a person would earn if they were skilled with auto estimation.

Alex stipulated that it would be nice to see if the auto estimator would bring transferrable skills and what other industries the students could be ready to work in. Another member asked, if the growth in the industry growth is 3.4% over the next 5 years, is this good? Will Coley stated in the scope of veteran's affairs anything under 10% is not viable.

Will stated we have to think that if the industry changes dramatically, will the students have employment? Such as autonomous cars, if they crash and the auto infrastructure changes, then the students may have a skill set that is useless. Katheryn stated she always thinks about a.) if the student is obtaining transferrable skills, and b.) is the education they are gaining going to get the student through the first door in meeting their goals?

A short-term program, such as skills certificates, is appealing especially if it leads to employment. The training needed to support the effort would need to be there such as language skills and math skills. The appeal is there for people already in the field, but for veterans or students entering the field may not have the employment opportunities available. Language skills can take years to develop. An apprenticeship added to the program would help. Katheryn asks should we have Laura come discuss more about the application, or should we decide to pursue another way or not to pursue? No direct answer was provided.

Will stated the 2nd row of the application, questions regarding eligibility, will be the key for his review. Cheo stated the need for bilingual employees is appealing, but what level of proficiency may be a factor. The language barrier is a concern. Cheo asks we think about this aspect with all applications and programs going forward. More questions come up regarding to teaching bilingual and publications of materials in both languages. Some programs have the instructor teaching the course as usual, but an ESL instructor will come and follow up in the class to help.

The students challenge with learning English becomes easier when the goal has a purpose. Mark asked if we can push back to the applicant to ensure ESL and Math skills would be packaged for the program? Katheryn stipulated this is a decision for the group.

This process scratches the surface in understanding what would make the auto estimator program work. Katheryn asked if the committee should compile a list of questions to ask the applicant. The committee replied yes.

The Autonomous Car application was discussed. The intention is to embed the electronic information into the existing curriculum. Will's concern that we don't know that this will be needed in the future. However, we see lower forms of the electronic systems in everyday

vehicles now. Also a topic pointed out included skills certificates gains. They are not counted unfortunately toward the Strong Workforce metrics.

Court Reporting is restructuring their whole program to involve stackable certificates. Scapist and CART will be skills certificates. The program is transitioning into a hybrid format as well. Since this program is going into revitalization now, so should it be first to review? This equipment is to ensure for hybrid. How is the hybrid translating as success as of today? The committee would like some more information and data, and where are they with their revitalization.

The ECE application was discussed. A question was raised, what happened in the first round of funding? Seems like there should be an assessment of the successes in the first portion of funding in order to assess the second round of funding. Katheryn will ask for more data on the successes of the first round of funding.

For next steps, Heather will create shared documents for listing questions or items about the applications of what the committee would like to learn more about. Katheryn will send out instructions.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.