

**Agenda Friday, January 31, 2019**

**10 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

**POMO Building 7, Room 105 (IVC)**

**MINUTES**

*As of 3/27/2020, minutes are pending approval. Contact Heather Rahman at for proposed corrections or edits.*

TOPIC	MINUTES/NOTES
<p>Welcoming and Introductions:</p> <p>In attendance: Wende Bohlke, Sharon Goldfarb, Melanie Palomino, Dolores Salazar, Cari Torres-Benavides, Kathleen Antokhin, Katheryn Horton, Alex Jones, Heather Rahman, Nancy Willet, Gina Cullen, and Ron Palmer (sitting in for Mark Barrall)</p> <p>Absent: Mark Barrall</p>	<p>Katheryn welcomed all members. Everyone introduced themselves and either suggested a ground rule for the meeting or announced their favorite dessert.</p> <p>Ground rules suggested included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To remain open to perspectives</li> <li>• To check your own possible preconceived notions and to remain unbiased</li> <li>• To Listen</li> <li>• To Follow up</li> <li>• To practice consistency</li> <li>• To stay focused on the SW vision</li> <li>• To provide clarification of criteria</li> <li>• To keep in mind the overall vision of COM for supporting the most students</li> <li>• To think of the long-term sustainability of projects and institutionalizing them</li> <li>• To promote student success &amp; opportunities</li> </ul>
<p>Review/Approve Current Meeting Agenda</p>	<p>Sharon and Alex motioned to approve the agenda, and Wende seconded the motion. All approved.</p>

<p>Review/Approve Minutes from 10/25/19</p>	<p>Minutes were not readily available for the group. The draft will be provided, and the committee will consider approving at a later time.</p>
<p>Overview and general discussion</p>	<p>Katheryn explained about the SW Program Incentive Funding Model Overview, so the committee can look through the lens of what can be of most value to Career Education and COM as a whole when evaluating the projects.</p> <p>Wendy made a point that through her research, including conversations with professionals, she found the reality of labor market demand and earnings do not match with the LMI reports provided.</p> <p>Sharon stated that some departments are becoming obsolete in her point of view. However, Advisory Committee members for every sector would respond that it's absolutely not true, especially the Court Reporting industry leaders.</p> <p>Gina stated that the job outcome for the students really should be the guide to determine where we put our funds.</p> <p>Ron stipulated that limited funds should also be a consideration when building new programs.</p> <p>Gina stated PRAC has a set amount of teaching units, so we need to look where those units will come from in examining some of the project proposals. If teaching units are added to a new or existing program, then where will they be subtracted from?</p> <p>Process and sustainability should also be factors for the institution to pick up the successful programs/projects.</p>

<p>Timeline Overview of Local Round 4 Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Feb 28 – Approval of Projects Determined</li><li>• March 2020 – Recommended Projects are reviewed by PRAC for approval</li><li>• April 2020 – Chancellor’s Office approves certified local proposals</li><li>• April 2020 – Approved projects are funded</li><li>• Quarterly Reports will be due: 7/15/2020, 10/31/2020, 1/5/2021, 4/15/2021, etc.</li><li>• OCT 31, 2021 – all funds must be utilized</li></ul>	<p>Katheryn explained the timeline. Nancy asked if we are measuring the projects against the outcome incentives. Katheryn stated we would like to have monthly SWAC meetings to continually review the projects.</p> <p>The committee deliberated about whether to know the round 4 budget first or review the projects first before reviewing the budget. Katheryn explained the idea of reviewing the projects without factoring in limited funds.</p>
---	--

Review and Open Discussion  
for Each Local Round 4 Project  
Proposal

The committee decided who to invite to speak to the group about their projects:

- Thomas Padron to speak more about The Event Management proposal
- Arron Wilder to clarify the Sustainable Ag proposal (We decided to earmark the funds for this, but wait until more information is known about the ELND program.)
- Cesar Pomajulca to explain more about the Paramedic Feasibility Study proposal

The committee requests the following proposals to be reworked:

- Auto Eco Car proposal to strengthen and gain more support (refer to Addendum A); consider breaking the proposal down to the different phases and to stretch across multiple rounds of funding
- Event management proposal to eliminate funds for writing curriculum and to clarify work-based learning opportunities
- MMST Video Program 4K proposal to explain how the equipment will tie into the incentive metrics
- CNC Lathe to elaborate any pertinent information following meeting the Regional Director
- CTE Pathways and Outreach proposal to reflect a reduction in budget
- Ophthalmology proposal to eliminate funds for writing curriculum

The committee decided on the following projects to fast-track in recommending to PRAC:

- CTE Pathways and Outreach
- CNC Lathe

Wendy motioned to approve them, Melanie seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The committee decided to take the following actions:

- Ask PRAC about support in finding teaching units for new or revised programs
- Ask to institutionalize spending for basic equipment upgrades

See **Addendum A** below for more information. Synopsis above was derived from statements highlighted in green.

<p>Review Budget for Local and Regional Round 4 Funds</p>	<p>Kathleen gave an overview of the funding and the breakdown of local and regional funds. <b>(See Figure 1.)</b></p> <p>Alex will be able to reduce the cost for the CTE Pathways/Outreach proposal by approximately \$15 – 20K.</p> <p>Decisions in the review of individual proposals are reflected in the chart enclosed. <b>(See Figure 2 for notes captured, read minutes for detail.)</b></p>
<p>Schedule Agenda and Timing for Next Meeting</p>	<p>The next meeting was determined for Feb 19 from 9 – 11 a.m. Katheryn will send out a calendar invite and follow up communications.</p>
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>Time: 1: 05 p.m.</p>

## Addendum A

The initial process to evaluate the proposals involved conducting the scoring first and then to discuss the projects. However, many committee members were not able to score proposals due to lack of information and repeated information. Therefore, the committee decided to first review each proposal together during this meeting.

It was pointed out that all of the scoresheets and the score grid spreadsheet will serve a future purpose if anyone wants to discuss any SWAC decisions for their proposal. The committee agreed that during discussion, scores will likely change anyway.

The committee discussed the difficulties in assessing each project and the lack of information or repeated elements. It was suggested training and examples should be provided to faculty simply to address these issues. Ron stated the current rubric scoring system is subjective, because someone assigning one score may weigh different to another committee member. Additionally, the committee suggested to create the rubric next time to reflect the differences in the program.

Before examining any of the proposals in depth, Katheryn stated the warranty for the manikin can be funded through the Perkins grant. Therefore, the **Health Sciences Manikin Service** proposal was omitted from discussions.

The committee decided to review the **Auto ECO Car proposal** first.

The committee's initial concerns involved the number of students to work on the project and how will the project help the program and Career Education. Ron gave an overview of this project.

Ron stated that the Auto program has the most completions in all of Career Education. Many industry folks have inquired why COM hasn't been involved with the Shell Eco-marathon event. The response has been in order for COM Auto program to enter the competition, the program would need funding and college support. This project ideally would pull in multiple disciplines including engineering students.

In the project, Ron expects the students will design and build the car to compete. The building of this vehicle would not be outsourced. This would be a perfect project to incorporate Makerspace program. This would be also act as a mechanism to build enthusiasm with area high school students. The Shell Eco-marathon is held every year at Sonoma Raceway. No bay area schools currently compete, but Santa Rosa Junior College (SRJC) might in the future. Could this be a Regional Joint Venture opportunity?

Duke University won the competition last year. We are not sure how many students formed any given team. The winning team were students studying mechanical engineering. The logic of COM entering into this project is that it will elevate the students into higher level of thinking, which will prepare them for higher wage jobs upon completion. The building of the vehicle will require Tungsten Inert Gas (TIG) welding. The project will bring in the enthusiasm and bring a participation of many departments.

Pipelines can be established through the high school systems because Ron is currently collaborating with some of the high school teachers. We might be able to bring in sponsors. COM has been looking at interdisciplinary opportunities for students where some engineering students should have access to machine technology, makerspace later on, and welding.

Dolly pointed out this project potentially poses a lot of work-based learning opportunities. She suggested if SWAC recommends a high amount funding for projects, then they should provide work-based opportunities for students in the program. Ron stated there are no work-based learning opportunities at this time in Auto.

It was pointed out that this project would be viewed differently by some members if we had certain elements in place such as work-based learning, pipelines and a workplan, which will involve in the other departments. Having the makerspace up and running will support the project.

However, by the time this project is funded, it will be a year later to enter into the race. Ron feels once the project is funded, the interest will build, but to gain interest first without the approval and funding would be more difficult. The competition takes place around April each year.

Katheryn pointed out that business relationships are still forming for the Auto department. Alex suggested to break up the proposal to meet the different phases for the Shell Eco-marathon competition, so later phases of meeting the requirements to compete can be funded by future rounds of Strong Workforce funds.

Alex suggested, while the project builds up to meet the first phase, the Career Education department and Auto Technology program could build the high school pathways and shape up our business partnerships. A concern was mentioned about if it even makes sense a small community college compete with schools like Duke. Many of the committee members responded not to totally discount the underdog. Ron will work with the businesses, other disciplines and high schools to get this project supported and make it successful. Gina think having the connections first will be important.

The committee decided to rest on this project for now and give Ron the chance to strengthen the proposal and support as discussed.

For timing purposes of the meeting, the committee agree to continue reviewing other applications.

The **CTE Pathways and Outreach** proposal was discussed next. Alex gave an overview to explain the proposal. Everything listed in the proposal is designed to maximize the point system of the incentive funding model. This proposal could assist toward the support for the other proposals. One concern mentioned was the management of this project to make sure all of the pieces roll out and stay on track as intended.

With the MCOE K-14 CTE Coordinator onboarding soon, it looks like many factors are converging to support work in this direction. For the years to follow, the pathways will be set up and communications will be lined up for the high school students to clearly understand what their options are for a career path.

Next, the committee decided to review the **Ophthalmology Assistant** proposal. This project is meant to be another segment for medical assisting students. The idea would be to incorporate into the existing MEDA program. No units would be added. Faculty can be paid to put together a program, but faculty is not to be paid to write curriculum. Therefore, the proposal will be re-written and resubmitted to the committee to reflect the salary asked for creating curriculum and to clarify the project more.

The **Paramedic Feasibility Study** proposal was written due to demand from the industry people and students. It will increase job opportunities and salaries. The proposal is about working with the workforce to meet the demand. The curriculum exists. Two concerns involve:

1. Who will commit and do the work?
2. Where will the units come from?

Cari suggested the SWAC committee clearly document this project since it's a good idea and most likely a successful program and present it to PRAC. The program will involve many teaching units, so our committee would be asking PRAC to possibly find a way to support the program with units. Per Sharon, SRJC offers a paramedic program, but their lead is retiring and their program will be greatly weakened. The committee will hold on this proposal at this time.

The committee then reviewed the **Event Management** proposal. Per Nancy, hospitality program overall is gaining some traction this semester due to online classes and working with Marin Oaks. This project could easily shape up as work-based learning program. Katheryn asked if this program could be offered as community education as a pilot. Other concerns are 1. this would be adding classes where we have no teaching units, and 2. instructors cannot be paid to develop curriculum. Gina suggests we invite Thomas to speak more about this project, and we ask him to rework the proposal.

The committee reviewed the **Sustainable Ag** proposal. Arron Wilder wasn't present to speak about this project. Nancy gave an overview as she has been reviewing ELND as a whole. Cari stated since some decisions are on the horizon concerning the ELND program, the timing isn't ideal. Therefore, she suggested that since it's a relatively low amount of funds requested, we could earmark the funds and revisit when the timing is better and more information is known. Dolly questioned if a certificate would be valuable. Perhaps the organic certificate could align with nationally recognized standards. The letters of support seemed comprehensive and issues were addressed by industry leaders, according to Dolly. The committee decided to hold this proposal.

The committee reviewed the **MMST Video Program 4K** proposal. This proposal is solely an ask for software and equipment. Nancy asked if this can be funded via Perkins, and if Strong Workforce is the correct area to fund it. The committee would like to know how this will tie into increasing enrollments or moving the other metrics. Committee to ask B. Lee to elaborate on this information. It was suggested PRAC could institutionalize spending to upgrade equipment. Katheryn stated that she would see if we can fund this through Strong Workforce first, and if not, then we can look at Perkins funding. SWAC will suggest to PRAC to keep basic program equipment upgrades going.

Ron gave an overview of the **CNC Lathe** proposal. Issues in the MMT work space are a factor after speaking with Greg Nelson. The HVAC needs upgrading in the shop. So, timing is of essence in getting the equipment and providing the space for the machine during the window of moving equipment around. The support for the machine comes from Mark Martin, the Regional Director of this sector and Joe Osborne who own OMW, Corp. and sits on the Advisory Board for MMT. Mark will be meeting with Alex and Ron on February 4<sup>th</sup>. The committee is interested in learning more information following this upcoming meeting, and the committee decided this proposal should be fast tracked for PRAC to decide.

Figure 1

# Round 4 Funding Scenarios

## #1: No Incentive Funding

<b>Local</b>	<b><u>\$251,660</u></b>
<b>Regional, to allocate</b>	<b><u>\$67,953</u></b>
<b>For Allocation</b>	<b><u>\$319,613</u></b>
<i>Regional- SCA</i>	<i>\$70,000</i>
Regional subtotal	\$137,953
<b>Total Project Budget</b>	<b>\$389,613</b>

## #2: Estimated \$120,000 Incentive Funding (\$80K local, \$40K Regional)

<b>Local</b>	<b><u>\$296,639</u></b>
<b>Regional- to allocate</b>	<b><u>\$87,953</u></b>
<b>For Allocation</b>	<b><u>\$384,592</u></b>
<i>Regional- SCA</i>	<i>\$70,000</i>
Regional subtotal	\$157,953
<b>Total Project Budget</b>	<b>\$454,592</b>

*(Round 3 Incentive Fund Totals: \$84,251 Local, \$46,338 Regional; Total: \$130,589)*

---

Figure 2

	A	B	C
1	<b>Round 4 Applications</b>	<b>Proposed budgets</b>	<b>Discussion, SWAC 1.31.2020</b>
2	CNC Lathe	\$ 65,000.00	
3	CTE Pathways/Outreach	\$ 101,731.00	\$ 86,731.00
4	Event Management	\$ 16,620.00	set project and budget aside for time being. Invite T. Padron to next SWAC meeting, to present and defend project.
5	MMST 4K	\$ 10,481.00	determine if this can be funded through Perkins or another fund.
6	Opthamology	\$ 54,000.00	set project and budget aside for time being. Invite Cesar P to revist/rewrite application and to attend next SWAC meeting to present and defend project.
7	Paramedic	\$ 14,625.00	remove from consideration per discussion
8	Shell Eco Marathon	\$ 137,500.00	
9	Sustainable Ag	\$ 7,000.00	set project and budget aside for time being. Invite A. Wilder to next SWAC meeting, to present and defend project.
10	Mannequins	\$ 22,000.00	set aside for Perkins FY21
11	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 289,231.00</b>	total of projects less amounts in gray cells
12			
13	decision (note highlights above) Recommend to PRAC		
14			