San Diego Mesa College Strong Workforce Committee Meeting Minutes

October 10, 2019 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., LRC-435

ATTENDEES	In Attendance	Absent
	Monica Romero	Amanda Johnston
	Ailene Crakes	Blythe Barton
	Amanda Horner	Cynthia Purnell
	Aracely Bautista	Danielle Lauria
	Claudia Estrada-Howell	Hai Hoang
	Danene Brown	Janue Johnson
	Jeaneal Davis	Katlin Choi
	Johanna Aleman	Leticia Lopez
	Karla Trutna	Melanie Baeza-McCray
	Mark Manasse	Pavel Consuegra
	Rachel Russell	Raquel Sojourner
	Shawn Fawcett	Robert Wong
	Tara Maciel	Sahar King
	Tasha Frankie	Tina Recalde
		Toni Parsons

CALL TO ORDER: By M. Romero at 3:05 p.m. in LRC 435.

- Welcome / Review and Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes 09/12/19 No comments, No questions, changes; motion to accept Claudia and Ailene second; committee approved.
 - o Agendas, minutes on CTE Website

ACTION ITEM: NONE

CONTINUING BUSINESS:

- Committee Outcomes / Goals and Workgroups
 - Budget & Allocation subgroup presented a draft model for allocating SW funds to programs that is linked to the BARC process, SW metrics and is an equitable and transparent process.
 - Presentation <u>Link to Presentation</u>
 - Strong Workforce Why
 - Prior Funding Process (16-17 & 17-18)
 - o Why A New Process?
 - o Process Drivers
 - Available Funding & Timelines
 - Metrics to Consider
 - Recommendation of process

Year	2018 - 2019	201	2019 – 2020		2020 - 2021	
Approximate Amount Available	\$30,000	\$50,	50,000 - \$75,000		\$50,000 - \$100,000	
Timeline	October-December 2019	Apri	April-May 2020		March-May 2021	
Review and decision			ubgroup brings recommendations o SW Committee for approval.		Strong Workforce Committee utilizes BARC rankings* and makes allocations decisions for allowable requests and available funding.	
Process ranking	 What requests are still unfunded? Do the programs still need what was requested? Are other sources available to fund the request? 	Split	 Split available funds into two pots: Based on Rubric Holistic approach for programs that have not received funding. 		 Split available funds into two pots: Based on Rubric Holistic approach for programs that have not received funding. 	
Notes	Allocations need to be determined by the end of October for funding deadlines.		nable to make modifications to ARC process for this year		*Ideally SW can be incorporated into BARC process. This may need refinement in the 2021-2022 cycle.	
Year	2018 - 2019	201	19 – 2020		2020 - 2021	
Criteria for Rankir	ng					
	owable? (Yes / No) – The CTE office w	ill pro	vide this data. Can	the goals of tl	ne request be	e met in another way?
	And if so what/how? 2) What is the BARC score?			Hidden and tiebreaker is		BARC score will be used to determine funding*
 Which Strong Workforce Metric(s) does this request directly address (examples needed): a. Enrollment b. Students Who Completed 9+ Credit CTE Units in One Year c. Students Who Obtained Degree or Certificate d. Students Who Transferred e. Students Employed in a Job Closely Related to Fiel of Study f. Median Percentage Change in Earnings g. Percentage Who Attained a Living Wage 		n	Not available for this year	Supplemental questions will be required from departments / programs / service areas		Incorporated into the BARC process
4) How is this re equity?	How is this request addressing, supporting, improving		Not available for this year	Information pulled from BARC submission		Incorporated into the BARC process
Year			2018 - 2019	2019 – 2020		2020 - 2021
 Return on investment a. Is this for a specific course? i. Which course(s)? ii. Is this a new part of the curriculum or and industry update? iii. How many sections of this course are run in a year? iv. What is the total enrollment in the course for a year? v. How is this need being met now? vi. What is the impact if the request is not funded? 		are e	Not available for this year	Supplemental questions will be required from departments / programs / service areas		Incorporated into the BARC process

 b. Is this for an entire department/program/service area? i. How many students will be impacted? ii. How is this need being met now? iii. What is the impact if the request is not funded? c. If this is not for a specific course or department/program/service area, please explain. 				
	been funded (all sources) for this department/program/service area and what are the	Information pulled from Program Review and BARC	Information pulled from Program Review and BARC	Incorporated into the BARC process (?)

- Discussion:
 - Discussion on two items to incorporate into the process:
 - Including criteria regarding the sustainability of the request (either the need for ongoing funding or maintenance and life expectancy.
 - Feedback mechanism should be established for those who do not get funded.
- Voting:
 - The Strong Workforce Committee approved the three year implementation plan.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Incorporate criteria for sustainability and method for feedback into the process.
- Proceed with recommended process with subgroup.

NEW BUSINESS:

- CTE Tutoring Regional Research (Manasse, Romero)
- Presentation Link to presentation
 - Tutoring Needs and Perceptions in Career Education
 - Study Process Overview: Regional Workgroup, Literature Review, Interviews, Focus Groups, Survey, Analysis/Findings and Recommendations.
 - Research was supported by a region-wide workgroups with Administrators, Faculty, Staff from both CTE and Tutoring as well as external consultant from Fresno City College, the team from the Centers for Excellence and researchers from USD's Non-Profit Institute.
 - Key Findings and Recommendations
 - Finding #1- The region's community colleges would benefit from a unified vision and brand for tutoring.
 Recommendation #1- Establish a region-wide vision and culture of "tutoring for all' instead of "tutoring for remediation".
 - Finding #2 Tutoring is primarily perceived as a remediation service. Recommendation # 2 Reinforce
 the "tutoring for all" message across the region by conducting a communications and marketing
 campaign that promotes the overall benefits of tutoring.
 - <u>Finding #3</u> There is a need for coordinated, collaborative, and sustained professional learning for tutors and CE faculty and staff with regard to tutoring. <u>Recommendation #3</u> Provide professional learning for tutors, faculty, and staff, emphasizing that the objective of tutoring is to empower students and develops their critical thinking and reasoning skills.

- o <u>Finding #4</u> Formalizing and communicating tutoring practices across campuses can increase the impact that tutoring has on student retention and success. <u>Recommendation #4</u> Develop and maintain a formal process and/or toll (e.g., virtual repository) for tutoring stakeholders to share and communicate effective and impactful resources and practices.
- Finding #5 Students, tutors, and CE faculty and staff all agrees that the professionalization and expansion of tutoring would contribute to their success. <u>Recommendation #5</u> – Prioritize and dedicate resources to the professionalization and expansion of tutoring across colleges to increase equity and access for students.
- Finding #6 Additional research will help the region to measure the current effectiveness of a unified tutoring programs, to measure success of innovative practices, and better understand barriers to CTE tutoring.
 Recommendation #6- Track outcomes of the region-wide strategic plan for CE tutoring (after implementation) and continue to study tutoring in concept and practice.

ACTION ITEM:

• Link to <u>full report</u> and <u>executive summary</u>

PROGRAM UPDATES/ROUND TABLE

Time was not available for Round Table

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 4:07 PM

Meeting Dates for 2019-2020 from 3:00 pm – 4:00 pm, Room LRC-435

- November 14 (room BT-101)
- December 12
- February 13
- March 12
- April 9
- May 14

Submitted by:	Aracely Bautist	a, Administrativ	ve Technician,	CTE
Approve	ed on:			