

Strong Workforce Action Committee (SWAC) Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 25, 2019

8:30 – 9:30 a.m.

Building 10, Rm 140

Attended Members: Ron Palmer, Melanie Palomino, Mark Barrall, Alex Jones, Kathleen Antokhin, Dolly Salazar, Katheryn Horton, Heather Rahman, Gina Cullen, Will Coley, Cari Torres-Benavides, Beth Pratt

Not in attendance: Cheo Massion, Kilia Nguyen, Mike Cairns

Introductions were made, and Katheryn Horton described the compilation of the committee with a mix of students, faculty, classified, counselors and ESL representation. She pointed out the items on the agenda would be covered.

- The SWAC Charge
- Strong Workforce background, qualifying projects, metrics
- Examples of Round 1 and Round 2
- Application process, rubrics and scoring
- Available budget for local Round 3 projects
- Process for decision making; timeline for presentations & approvals
- Meeting Wrap Up/Next steps

Katheryn Horton started the meeting with the CTE Strong Workforce presentation, which gave a general overview of funding and projects. The funding is greater than \$160 million legislated by the State to Community Colleges, and funding is increasing each year. Around \$1 million annually has been granted to College of Marin for Career and Technical Education.

Funding comes to College of Marin for local projects and regional projects. About 70% is for local and around 30% is for regional type projects. This committee will primarily concentrate on local projects.

Katheryn explained the successful COM/CTE projects using the funding from Round 1 and Round 2 local funding, including COM's new Hospitality Management program, new Graphic Designer certificate, new Webmaster certificate, new Nursing Sims Lab, etc.

Strengths of CTE, which have come from the funding, include extended marketing, connections with industry partners and open dialogues through the program Advisory Committee meetings, data tracking, stronger partnerships with high schools, etc.

The committee reviewed the Charge of the committee, with an emphasis to keep everything transparent in our decisions and discussions. Responsibilities of SWAC highlighted in the presentation include:

- Build awareness of the Strong Workforce program and provide transparent updates on all Strong Workforce projects, including student success metrics.
- Convene CTE faculty to identify funding opportunities that are in alignment with the Strong Workforce mission, formula, criteria, and local and regional labor market needs.
- Develop, review, and communicate timeline, guides, forms, and recommendations.
- Establish appropriate timelines and processes to complete local and regional applications for recommended projects.
- Make recommendations to PRAC for proposal funding while working collaboratively with Union District Workload Committee (UDWC) on any grant proposal involving faculty workload.
- In coordination with the Workforce Department, review that stated project goals are being met.
- Annually evaluate performance of all Strong Workforce projects and make recommendations to PRAC based on findings.

Katheryn explained the packet is what the faculty received to begin the application process. Faculty were given the application, rubric, a sign off page, timeline, the incentive metrics for funding. Beth Pratt asked if all have reviewed the Charge and feel comfortable with the responsibilities. No one responded negatively.

Katheryn explained the metrics listed are what the State is looking for as a result of the projects. The metrics are a way to stay accountable and qualify for more funds. This is the last page of the packet. CTE gathers much of the data from the CTEOS survey for COM CTE students who have completed their education after taking at least 9 CTE units. COM ranks high in survey response rates compared with other community colleges (40%). CTEOS is conducted by Santa Rosa Junior College. More responses will give us better data on student success in the workplace.

Marc Barrall asked if we get any recognition for the industry-recognized National certificates that students earn. The answer is not yet, but it's going that way.

Katheryn reviewed the rubric on page 4 of the packet. This has been the way applications have been scored for the last 2 years to see if the funding requests meet the criteria. Requirements include labor market information, which Heather Rahman researches and provides for each application. The labor market information shouldn't only be an in-demand program, but jobs must be in demand as well.

Gina Cullen asked if the job training is taken in account when the students may not need a COM program if they are getting the training on a job. SWAC will have further discussion about jobs that don't necessarily require certificates, but where skills are needed. Mark Barrall stated we have to give the students what the employers are looking for to give them a foot up in landing the jobs by having the skills.

Through the Advisory Committees, CTE is learning from the industry leaders where there is a gap in the education and skills going into employment. Will Coley stated that the labor market information doesn't predict how well the student will turn out as an employee. He thinks we really need the internships set up to help the students build their experience and skills to lead from COM to employment.

What SWAC is trying to do is look at students going to transfer, too, and not just the certificate gaining student. They can be students in E2C, Compass and AS-T tracked students.

Will stated we have to look at this from the standpoint of the employer. This is where the real answers lay. This is another reason we have our advisory committees.

Auto programs at COM are as good or better than internships according to Ron Palmer. So, the students are getting hired. However, another value is networking through the students into internships, Will pointed out.

Back to the rubric, there are things the committee wants to keep in mind when reviewing the applications. They will want to look to see if there is a clear vision of the project with what it will include, including who is the owner of the project. We haven't decided if we are going to use this rubric for each project in the next meeting, but since this has been the measurement for scoring, we will want to have a rubric for each project review. Mark Barrall is making an improvement to the rubric before the next meeting.

Round 3 projects are what SWAC will be recommending to PRAC. Funding also covers the overhead costs, such as marketing, travel, office equipment, salaries and benefits, etc. Marketing has been a huge factor involved with the different projects including the CTE newsletters, collaborating with K-12, social media marketing, pathway sheets and brochures.

Next steps for SWAC include reading, discussions and scoring applications. SWAC has to vote on the funding allocations by April 2019. It was decided that applications should be reviewed before the presentations. The length of presentations will be about 10 minutes, and then the group will want to ask questions. CTE has already vetted the applications and do not think any

will be kicked backed by the Chancellor's office. The budget will be considered. If SWAC is allowing 15 minutes per project proposal, then we are looking at 4 hours of just presentations and Q & A sessions. How can we save time? We could only have questions and answers and no presentation, and we can simplify the rubric. It will be o.k. as long as we standardize the system for all proposals to be weighed fairly.

The presentation is valuable with more technical subjects where we can get a simple explanation from the professional. If you are a SWAC member and submitting a proposal, you will need to recuse yourselves from the scoring and budget division. Keep in mind funding can be drawn from other sources.

SWAC makes the recommendation to PRAC, but they probably won't assign the budget amount. They will most likely reject or accept and we will need to rereview the rejected amounts. The rubric doesn't account for a clear cost point analysis to see if we are getting the most for the dollar. We might want to modify this in the future.

Another thing after the new proposals are reviewed and scored, SWAC may want to review the existing projects to debrief on those successes or failures to learn from. Round 2 funding must be spent and completed before new proposals are submitted.

Will stipulated we have to keep our eyes on the student outcomes and not get bogged down on the projects and funding. Beth stated that some projects never got off the ground due to capacity issues. You can see the difference if you look at the projects from Round 1 vs. Round 2 and the current Round 3 proposals.

The question was raised, does the SWAC group want a discussion first and then listen to faculty? Yes. No presentation will be needed but a brief overview and time to answer questions. But, in some circumstances, a picture or two could help. Faculty should explain how the project will benefit the program and benefit the students.

Next meeting agendas were discussed: to review the applications and rubric scoring system with lunch available because it will be a longer meeting.

Respectfully,

Heather Rahman
Workforce Specialist
College of Marin