



TO: *Board of Governors' Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy* Co-chairs Sunny Cooke, Lynn Shaw, and Tim Rainey

Attached is a 19-page compilation of the "CTE-Strong Economy Regional Conversation with CIOs" that were held at our Spring Conference. The summary notes were compiled by note takers in the ten CIO regions. Please note that minimal editing has occurred. The notes have been left as "bullets" rather than complete sentences.

The Chief Instructional Officers of the California Community College system respectfully offer these recommendations for your consideration:

- 1) FTES funding for CTE programs needs to be funded differentially due to the higher cost per student in the typically smaller CTE courses that colleges offer. For example, if funding were to be set at a 2-to-1 enrollment formula, then a 15-student CTE laboratory would earn FTES as if enrollment were 30 students.
- 2) Replace the grant-funded model for CTE and Workforce training with a continual and sustainable stream of funding based on sound instructional planning, which can be similar to the categorical funding model used in the Student Success and Support and Student Equity Plans that have been successfully funded this past year. Allow colleges to design their plans for effective delivery of CTE and workforce training that business and industry needs. Support the funding for risky new start-up programs. Support marketing of all CTE and workforce training programs. Support stable and long-term staffing plans that sustain the outreach activities of the college as they develop partnerships with business and industry.
- 3) Modernize the facilities regulations that define assignable square footage space categories so that CTE programs have more flexibility in leasing new spaces (perhaps from industry partners) or upgrading existing spaces to reflect modern industry standards. Support leases identified in the college plans with the funding needed to quickly offer the classes and programs that business and industry need.
- 4) Re-evaluate how Regions are structured and how programs are allocated to specific colleges to ensure that student access and completion in CTE programs is possible. Excessively aggressive limitation of programs within one or too few colleges within a Region

may actually deny access to students because of insurmountable transportation challenges they face across large regions or smaller densely populated regions.

- 5) The role of CIOs in developing strong occupational programs that secure jobs for our students is central to the conversation. The one reform that will move the needle most effectively is closer alignment of the roles of the CIOs with the Regional Consortia, the Sector Navigators, and the Deputy Sector Navigators as colleges reach out to business and industry.

Many other comments of value were made during the Regional Conversations with CIOs which can be used as appropriate by the Task Force support team and the Task Force members.

Please make this information available to all Task Force members. Thank you for your consideration of these important ideas.

*S. Craig Justice*

Vice President for Instruction

Irvine Valley College

President, California Community Colleges

Chief Instructional Officers (CCCCIO)

[cjustice@ivc.edu](mailto:cjustice@ivc.edu)

Telephone: 949-451-5577

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

**CIO FOCUS QUESTIONS RE: WORKFORCE, JOB CREATION AND  
A STRONG ECONOMY: CEMENTING STRONGER RELATIONSHIPS  
WITH BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY**

*At the Regional Meeting sessions at the CCCCIO Spring Conference on Thursday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, each region had its “CTE-Strong Economy Regional Conversation” that will inform the CCCCIO and Task Force about CIO concerns, suggestions, and expressed desired outcomes.*

1. **Funding A.** Many suggestions are coming forward to improve funding for CTE and workforce development, including paying a higher rate for CTE/STEM FTES, increasing funding for instructional equipment, maintenance of equipment, facilities upgrades, among others. What other suggestions would you like to pursue?
2. **Funding B.** The CTE grant-funding model has been widely criticized as leading to “grant fatigue” and does not generate a sustainable source of funds when programs become institutionalized. To preserve flexibility and local control, and to create sustainability, a program of SSSP- and SEP-like categorical funding is being discussed to replace much of the grant funding that exists currently. If this happens, what do you want it to look like? What does your wish list consist of?
3. **Personnel.** Staffing is a college decision. Do we need a funding stream to find a way to ensure our completers find the jobs they became educated for? Should career placement functions be a part of Instruction?
4. **Facilities.** More personnel and upgraded quality of programs have an impact on facilities. What suggestions do you have regarding facilities issues such as capacity-load ratios, use of categorical funds to improve CTE labs and classrooms, et al.? Impact of leased spaces on facilities master planning?
5. **Marketing and Outreach.** Informing prospective students (from high schools and the community) requires effective strategic marketing to the target groups. Funding will be required. What is the role of the regional consortia and DSNs in marketing and outreach? What are your suggestions?
6. **Data and Metrics.** What new metrics would you recommend to serve CTE/Workforce better? Do you feel you have sufficient data to inform the gainful employment requirements? Please offer your ideas.
7. **Curriculum and Program Approval.** Addressing workforce needs and closing the “jobs gap” require rapid response when the proven solution is a credit certificate program. If the labor market research analysis, model curriculum, and regional advisory processes were “front loaded” at the regional level, colleges could respond faster to the needs of business and industry. How would you define the CCCCIO’s role in this process? Speak to the role of “Centers of Excellence” assigned to your region?

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

8. **Faculty and DSNs.** At the college and regional level, the college faculty along with the Deputy Sector Navigators should be discussing how best to align curriculum, streamline program effectiveness, and begin to produce a steady flow of trained workers to become employed in the sector. Some regions reported a “rocky start” particularly in areas of communication, definition of roles relative to faculty, understanding strategic planning, etc. DSN’s participated in curriculum training earlier this year and roles appear to be clarified (e.g. DSN’s do not write the curriculum as that’s the faculty’s role). How is this model working now in your region? Cite any areas where this model appears to be beneficial. Identify areas that are not working as well as you’d like and suggest how to improve. Is there a sufficient number of DSNs for your region? How well do you know them?
9. **Sectors and Regions.** One size does not fit all. Rural, suburban, and urban colleges have different experiences with the Regional approach to adult and workforce/CTE regional approaches currently operating under the auspices of Regional Consortia. Where is the regional approach “working” and why? Where does the regional approach not work so well? Why? What suggestions do members of your region have to improve processes, communication, and regional allocation of resources? Are regions defined in a feasible and logical manner? If not, what are your recommendations?
1. Do you support the main effort being primarily on emerging high-growth/high-wage sectors?
  2. To what extent should Regional Consortia also focus on steady-growth/good wage sectors, particularly when allocating enhanced CTE funding?
10. **CIOs and Regional Consortia Planning.** CIOs have a critical role in strategic planning, enrollment management, institutional effectiveness, and accreditation. There is a strong desire to engage CIOs more in the planning activities of the Regional Consortia. How can this best be accomplished? Some have suggested an annual planning “summit” that includes all college CIOs in the region. To what extent do you support this idea? Other suggestions?
11. **Other.** What other comments do you have regarding the Task Force’s work?

**NOTE: PLEASE STAY APPRISED OF ADULT EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTS. REVIEW THE VOTING STRUCTURE IN THE REGIONAL CONSORTIUM. REGIONAL ADULT EDUCATION CONSORTIA SHOULD RESPECT THE COLLEGE’S ROLE IN MANAGING NONCREDIT CURRICULUM, FUNDING, AND STAFFING OF THE COLLEGES. NON-COLLEGE MEMBERS SHOULD PROVIDE ADVICE, BUT DECISIONS ABOUT THESE MATTERS ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COLLEGES, WHICH ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR CURRICULUM, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT, AND ACCREDITATION.**

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

**Summary Notes of the Regional Conversations**

**Region 1 – Far North**

1. Funding A: Funding for CTE faculty that would be continuing; hiring CTE faculty on the front end of planning for program design; request for a formula based on number of students, community needs; how can we do a better job of tracking emerging trends (money for additional data collection), bring money to the table to partner; making the Santa Rosa Survey statewide (tracking completions, job placements); pay for external contracts to collect data/track completions; rollover capacity for the Block Grant
2. Funding B: Grant management has been challenging on every front. If you are starting a program, it takes more than three years to become institutionalized, the idea that it comes out of apportionment is old thinking; consider flexibility in use of equipment/facilities in planning phase. \*\* Earlier input from colleges, funding should be more general, more formula based, more flexible to allow autonomy of colleges to assess and respond to the needs of their communities/students for increased sustainability. The far north has different needs than the Los Angeles area, One Size Fits All equals One Size Fits None. Trust us up front, give us some targets, if we don't meet those, reduce the funding. The Chancellor's Office Vision may be mismatched with an individual community/college needs.
3. Personnel: Funding sounds good, but usually it comes with a directive about how the money will be spent and sometimes it doesn't match the needs of the college. Should career placement be part of instruction?—perhaps at the level of Full time Instructional faculty who are connected to local industry partners with back up through the Career Liaison Person, but not necessarily through the Instruction office. Again, staffing should be a college decision. The CC mission is pushing in multiple directions—Adult Education, Dual Enrollment, Baccalaureate Degrees, mental health, adding job placement responsibilities is stretching it further.
4. Facilities: Categorical funding for facilities seems to work. However, it's not just buying new equipment—need to upgrade aging infrastructures. As industry needs change, even relatively new programs may need to be renovated. Perhaps more thought about multi-use facilities for CTE programs.
5. Marketing and outreach: When there are statewide curriculum changes, i.e. a shift to High Wage/High Need CTE, the messaging/marketing rarely reaches the student. It is now the responsibility of each college, and it would be helpful to have resources through the Chancellor's Office. Some campaigns, i.e. advertising statewide for ADTs could be broadcasted on radio, billboards, in high schools. The regional DSN might be able to use a coordinated message, but can't necessarily represent the programs at each individual college.
6. Data and Metrics: Could there be some centralized data collection? For small colleges, the data collection takes hundreds of labor hours to report on very small numbers of students, and makes it prohibitive.
7. Curriculum and Program Approval: If Centers of Excellence reached out and made their services available, they might be more useful. At this point, the colleges at the table have only

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

taken advantage of these services minimally. Front loading at the regional level would need to be facilitated by faculty groups, and it sounds like a good idea if it helps put programs together. Templates would be great if not too directive. Consider C-ID's for CTE course.

8. Faculty and DSNs: DSNs seem to be responding to requests from the colleges and but not taking an active or guiding role. Looking for further definition of DSN role and communication structures. Benefits include being a good resource— a broader perspective, sometimes they have a little money to help get a project done, good sense of connection with what's going on regionally. We know the DSNs from our campus, but not from surrounding colleges.
9. Sectors and Regions: Perhaps the regions should be more flexible. a) There are some moderate wages jobs that we don't want to neglect, particularly in rural areas. Sometimes those lower wage jobs are excellent entry level jobs, until they have the skills/maturity to move up. Sometimes special populations, like Dept. of rehab students, need some of those jobs. b) For rural colleges, steady-growth/good-wage sectors are very important.
10. CIOs and Regional Consortia Planning: The best model in the state seems to be in San Diego, there is a regional consortia (program approval) and an oversight body to help with better communication. Create a new communication structures between CTE, CIOs, and CEOs.

**Region 2 – North Central**

1. Answers to 1 & 2 combined: Funding A & B
  - CTE Differential Funding – SB 770/278 – request for categorical for CTE, include STEM
  - Cannot include applications, restrictive usage requirements, or restrictive reporting requirements (money should be able to be moved to address needs of college)
  - Lift restrictions on materials fee
  - Differential funding could be used for all categories of expenditures including full-time faculty
  - Difficulty with finding CTE faculty – can't afford to hire
  - Often FT faculty also have to do outside accreditation requirements; consider facilitation of ability to share directors (rotating among the colleges)
3. Personnel.
  - Universal ID for students that follows them from K-12 through completion and into job market
  - Need money for staffing to support the career functions for CTE programs outside of our Transfer Centers because the program faculty are overloaded with other responsibilities
  - Needs to be more intentional and part of instruction and integrated into the ed plans of students
  - CalPass+/LaunchBoard -- needs to be 'opt out' for students rather than needing them to register
4. Facilities.
  - Improve differential funding as stated above – and include flexibility to allow colleges to move the money to areas of need
  - Need to change cap-load ratio (doesn't count non-credit, online usage, etc.); block scheduling makes it appear that we aren't utilizing our facilities
5. Marketing and Outreach.
  - High Schools are getting lots of money to develop CTE; need to ensure the curriculum and develop align so that students transition; concern that students will be college ready

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- Happy with DSNs, but don't have enough support at the college end to manage them (administrative support)
  - When DSNs are attached to the colleges and understand the nuances of local curriculum/planning process, it works well; otherwise, it appears that they take dollars off the table that could be used for programs. For some, it is the attitude that "you are hosting me, but I don't report to you" but don't understand the reporting structure; doesn't seem to be a joint discussion for establishing goals
    - Need to incorporate more input from CIOs into planning for what DSNs do
  - Marketing -- regionalize marketing could be a challenge when we are 'chasing FTES', we want to promote our own programs
    - Focus marketing on the general concepts on why CC's are better, opportunities for students
    - Consider development of generic templates (either statewide or regional) that could be modified by the colleges so colleges don't have to pay for design, layout, etc.; easily personalized by colleges
    - Focus on availability of CTE training outside the privates
6. Data and Metrics.
- Capture students who come to use for one or two classes to improve job skills
  - Missing the data on tracking individuals after they leave us – see #3
  - Need to hear from employers on what they need in relation to our degrees/certificates (re-evaluate roles of some of the advisory committees)
  - Develop regional advisory committees
  - Consider sharing FT faculty between divisions to revitalize programs
7. Curriculum and Program Approval.
- Support development of CTE model curriculum (similar to TMC) designed by faculty at the state level that could be modified at the local level
  - Who are the Centers of Excellence? Who do they work for? Who do they report to? What do they do? How do we better integrate them better into the colleges? How do they interface with DSNs?

**Region 3 – San Francisco/East Bay**

1. Funding A
- Push more regional funds to colleges
  - revise standard productivity rate for CTE program to a higher rate
  - no more competitive grants
  - to claim FTES vs. Contract Ed. and to get rid of "opening" criteria
2. Funding B
- STEM/Health Science need higher rate
  - tracking system linked to Social Security
  - another mechanism degree/certificate
3. Linkage to WIB "Job Developer" positions
- Regional meetings with CIO re. ETP and WIB
4. Block grants for Instructional Equipment and CTE facilities improvement
- technology related to CTE

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

5. Stop DSN from making decisions without input from CIO

**Region 4 – Southwest Bay**

**general comments**

- a. challenges around unreliable funding streams, especially for high-cost equipment
- b. inequity in costs and resources for different CTE programs
- e. re-fund the base
- f. reduce wasted resource use in “requesting” funding
- g. “momentum point facilitators for credentialing and completion”

**1. funding A**

- a. basing programmatic funding on FTES is misguided
- b. what about a reserve fund built up for programmatic needs, including depreciation, maintenance, warranty, software upgrades and replacement costs?

**2. funding B**

- a. current system forces us to choose between funding current program and new program
- b. what’s the point of introducing new funds when current projects are not fund
- c. grant model favors large colleges who can distribute workload *and* costs
- d. one side of AB 86 funded smoothly and thoughtfully and other side setting up competition
- e. tremendous mis-allocation of resources regionally and *within* colleges
- f. capacity building is necessary—too many “partnerships” required . . .
- g. South Bay JPA model is quite effective

**3. personnel**

- a. some direct funding for career guidance and workforce placement is necessary
- b. also could be mandated in Student Equity fund or SSSP

**4. facilities**

- a. software could allocate space by TOP Code
- b. another example of second class status of CTE in the academy

**5. marketing and outreach**

- a. some DSNs are effective, e.g., by creating consistent structures and materials like templates
- b. it’s time for an assessment of the functions and effectiveness of our DSNs
- c. statewide campaign for CCC to fight the DeVry and other for-profits
- d. marketing is for our students, potential students, industry and other employers, etc.

**5. data and metrics**

- a. tracking completers is necessary
- b. don’t need a new IEPI or other set of expectations, but DO need better data
- c. accountability for CTE faculty leaders is already VERY high
- d. DSNs train faculty in incentivized sessions for LaunchBoard and other data

**6. curriculum and program approval**

- a. create standard (similar to CID) to certify statewide off-the-shelf programs
- b. what about a regional “curriculum steward” to ensure currency and robustness of materials, SLOs, etc.
- c. much would need to be worked out locally and statewide

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

**Region 5 – East Central**

**1. Funding A.**

- Faculty! **Additional** money for instructional faculty—not just moving funds around to help cover these costs.
- Funding needs to be sustainable.
- Local control of designated CTE funds to address needs of the college (in regards to CTE).
- Funds should not be restrictive. Colleges should be allowed to deem what areas have the highest priority for these CTE funds as determined by the college’s integrated planning processes.
- Need **additional** funding for research since recent CTE funding require meeting/exceeding established (or new) metrics.
- Have students utilize the ETPL program that is supported by the local WIBs. This is a great resource, but may not be the only resource. <Side note: the CIOs need additional training for the ETPL. Cris McCullough is going to provide additional information.

**2. Funding B.**

- Funds should be allocated directly to the college, and not the district.
- Metrics for funding could be derived from Scorecard (but this is old data); unemployment rates; education achievement; actual cost estimates for facilities, equipment, etc.; SEP data (that includes CTE degrees); enrollment data by TOPs codes.
  - **Utilize existing data—do NOT mandate new metrics when appropriate metrics already exist.**
- Need a mechanism for funding up startup costs of new needed programs (to be responsive to industry needs).
  - Collaboration within the region via the Regional CIO group to determine new programs being requested.
  - Funding **should not** be drive/decided by the Consortia (that consists of the DSNs.)
- Funding for data mechanism to report to capture the number local certificates earned by students

**3. Personnel.**

- Career/Job Placement Centers aligned with helping our graduates find jobs, not only finding a CTE program/major.
  - Career/Job Placement Centers should a balance between instruction and student services.
  - **Career/Job Placement Centers are more than just a place with flyers and information, they include embed “career caseworkers” in the classroom to help students (working side-by-side with the instructional faculty)**
- All staffing should be a college decision, including the DSNs.
- Could leverage student equity funds for minority groups (or at risk groups) to help with job placement

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- Also a dedicated funding stream for this service to ensure that students are not only completing, but are moving on into a career.

**4. Facilities.**

- Federal funding says that funding cannot be set on facilities. Funding needs to be specifically directed and support of CTE facilities and maintenance of equipment.

**5. Marketing and Outreach.**

- Faculty and staff really do not have time to dedicate to this much needed service. Where should this responsibility fall? Colleges need dedicated staff to advocate and support these programs.

**6. Data and Metrics.**

- More research staffing is needed to address this, among all of the other research requirements!
- Training for the instructional side (for faculty and deans) regarding Gainful Employment. For example, how this impacts students' ability to receive financial aid. In addition, accreditation is following this same path.

**7. Curriculum and Program Approval.**

- CIOs have no idea or any information regarding the role of Centers of Excellence.
  - However, the CTE dean at the table seemed to know more about it.
- Information seemed to be free for the few CIOs that said they used it.
- If information is “front loaded,” CIOs need to be a part of the conversation.

**8. Faculty and DSNs.**

- The DSN model is not effective...compared to a patchwork quilt. Some areas are working, and others are not. Most CIOs could not identify their DSNs.
- Who does the DSN report to? Colleges hired DSNs, but do not supervise them.
- CIOs do NOT know what the DSNs are doing, especially those that reside on their campus.
- What is the DSN role? How are they helping the campuses—where is the evidence that they are effective?
- Funding for DSNs could have a significant impact on campuses for needs addressed in questions above.
- Lack of communication, lack of transparency, inconsistent of communication.
- **Return value of DSN for our region is very low (if not \$0!).**
- CIOs do not understand the role or impact of a DSN.
- CTE deans seem to know the DSNs and what they are doing.
- Our region (Region 5) is nothing like the other regions...three hours long between one end and the other.

**Region 6 – West Central**

**1. Funding A.: What other suggestions would you like to pursue?**

- Paying a different rate FTES for CTE and STEM. Seems dangerous to pay courses at a higher rate. Possibility of gaming the system. Concern: Will this create a sliding scale in the minds of legislators-i.e. lower funding for Humanities, etc.
- Money must be allocated to infrastructure; or it will be used for salaries and benefits

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- Separate funding for equipment for CTE.
  - Look at specific funds that address capital equipment needs.
  - Don't want same type of Perkins requirements. We have grant fatigue in CTE.
  - We just funded noncredit--why would we want to create another funding structure?
  - Equipment is the specific need. We haven't caught up with past maintenance.
  - When we have additional infrastructure needs for equipment (power, facilities). Older campuses in particular really suffer.
  - We need sustainability of funding for maintenance and equipment
  - "Match" under grant funding is prohibitive.
  - End Summary: Focus on equipment, maintenance. No strings attached.
2. Funding B. Replace grant funding--what does it look like? Consist of?
- Stop doling things out in tiny chunks that require exhaustive application process. Reporting that accompanies this is cumbersome
  - Grant fatigue: Regional collaboration to sustain grants creates fatigue that isn't related to FTES generation, etc. Everyone wants something shiny and new, but there is no money to sustain the well-established programs. We need to redefine--commit to funding the base. Established programs should be eligible for funding.
  - Regional leaders emerge; how can other colleges move into leadership?
  - There is a myth of personnel. Institutional commitments to these resources are missing. When colleges serve as leaders, it drains away from our commitment to our own colleges/students.
  - We are all running out of faculty to do things. Planning needs to address local needs.
  - Evaluation component for grants; we don't have enough researchers to really meet the promises of the grants.
  - End Summary: Grant fatigue--includes application, campus resources, and evaluation/research. Also part of this is the sustainability.
  - We are still using the same people--it pulls us away the core of what we are supposed to be doing.
  - CTE though often feels like it is on the side. The resources help to drive CTE back into the core. We get funding to do materials of the grant, but not support personnel for the work of the grant
  - What do we want it to look like?
    - Increase overall payment per FTES funding rate.
    - We need a five year plan for implementation that is similar to SSSP and Equity (categorical and ongoing)--not one year by year.
3. Personnel: Do we need a funding stream . . . ?
- Job development and job placement: We need funding to follow up on placements. Look at the private sector model for following up. This is not a faculty position.
  - What is the intersection between our career centers and job placement and follow up? They don't connect.

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- Are colleges now employment agencies? Should we put our resources here?
  - Divorce development from placement. Skills and curriculum is one thing; placement is a completely different issue.
  - We need to do a better job with career exploration. Most of our students are guided into a transfer pathway when they would benefit from a greater exposure to CTE pathways. Students need to do an ed plan AND a career plan.
  - End summary: Yes, we need a funding stream. Part of instruction but not necessarily faculty. These could be classified. This is not just another counselor.
  - The transfer model just doesn't work for CTE. Transfer center = transfer and career transition.
4. Facilities: Suggestions?
- State has to fund the total cost of ownership for programs
  - Recommendations: consider option to locate programs in industrial parks; co-habitate with industry partners. Integrating credit and noncredit.
5. Marketing and outreach: What is the role of regional consortia and DSNs in marketing and outreach?
- Outreach is part of student success and equity.
  - Targeting HS students
  - DSN's role is outreach to industry. Not the HS piece or community piece.
  - HS and community outreach is an institutional commitment/campus based.
  - Should we have regional outreach efforts? What about programs-at-a-glance?
  - End Summary: Outreach should be done by campuses. DSNs role is to outreach to industry.
6. Data and metrics. Sufficient data
- Make the LaunchBoard work. We have limits on data (no unitary data). EDD data elements. Example: culinary worker at the hospital gets coded as a "hospital worker" not a culinary worker. LaunchBoard is only as good as the data you put in. Include the data source that includes your job specialization.
  - How do we capture independent contractors? Skills builders? Free-lancers?
  - Capture third party licensures.
  - We need all of the above to show program successes.
7. Curriculum and program approval. "front loaded" at the regional level?
- a. What is the existing relationship with your "Centers of Excellence"?
  - b. As a region the CIOs don't interface with the Centers of Excellence.
  - c. Deans are better connected than CIOs to Centers of Excellence.
  - d. Historical (looking back) data create programs that flood the market with outmoded programs: Centers of Excellence should have more current data.
  - e. Curriculum approval process: Local or regional curriculum process to make decisions to get ahead of the curve for emerging needs?
  - f. Owned by faculty: ingrained as part of the culture. State certifications and curriculum patterns might streamline the process to help local and regions move more quickly?

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

8. DSNs. Regions vs. Colleges

- The DSN process might not be ideal. Building expensive programs in regional training centers may be the wave of the futures. Should be better integrated--we haven't done enough to incorporate their work.
- DSN: Outside the academy, making recommendations to curriculum and they might not understand the system. Their work is to connect us to industry. Curriculum is above and beyond that. We DO need the connection to industry.
- Role of Advisory Committees: How do DSNs interface with the recommendations from advisory committees? A possibility of moving advisory committees to the regional area, beyond just the local colleges. Our partners have "advisory committee" fatigue. They would prefer to meet with one large group. We need to reach broadly to achieve industry certification (if properly integrated).
- DSNs are not competition--they should be resources.
- How are we defining regions? Do our students really go across our region for their training needs? Our region is too vast for students to really travel for their training. Shouldn't we all be focused on the industry certifications?
- If we keep DSNs, then the job descriptions need to be assessed and modified. Some colleges don't see the tangible benefits.
- End Summary:
  - The LaunchBoard needs to work.
  - Need to fund testing centers on campuses for CTE.
  - Grant fatigue: Faculty are exhausted; CTE programs only have 1-2 faculty. Between community, program reporting, curriculum, etc., we are exhausting our faculty. When do they teach?
  - We need funding to hire the support staff.
  - What about the students--how do we keep them at the core? Students are no longer at the center of our discussions among all these initiatives.
  - Industry input can help to create a standard curriculum. Find standard programs and create program reviews for the state level based on competencies and industry standards.
  - Address local and regional capacity. Create workers for our service areas. Maintain responsiveness to local needs.
  - Treat CTE like the TMCs only better process. Allow for flexibility but create a standard framework.

**Region 7 – Los Angeles**

1. Funding A.

- a. Texas funds certain program with supplemental funding for faculty. Biggest problem with nursing is recruiting from field...they can make so much more in the field than in the community college....radiation tech is another....students are getting jobs ...why did stem come up? Biotech and engineering. In most campuses they don't capture all of the funding that is about hiring someone at the state level to help with moving CTE programs...or by region.

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

b. The original concept of the DSN was to help with moving curriculum, but it turned out that many of them were unprepared and did not know what to do...training has been done. Another issue is DSN working with faculty to spend money but the deans and VPs don't know what is going on. Finding out after the fact that the faculty have pots of money and it doesn't meet the educational goal, mission or have no way to sustain the program. Monies are available but there is no way to spend in a timely way but then gets swept....

c. Timeliness...put in for CTE money in January, but the monies don't appear until June....want to get the work done but it is hard because the money is not there. If funding is increased what happens when it is decreased. Multifaceted problem, funding is one issue the other is curriculum....and what happens with faculty.

2. Funding B.

Requirement--if east wants to do manufacturing and are paired with riverside, there is no way it will work .....we know who to partner with...grant funding should not be based labor market only....we have partnerships within the district but it is not just limited to the district we have grants with other districts....the district offices don't always have the interests of individual college in the mind....we want to do what is best for the program and students, and this is getting lost in the bureaucracy.....

3. Personnel.

Response: the real issue is who is going to do it....tell the chairs, we need data to make decisions. Tracking is a problem for individual colleges, should be a state issue....i would love to see career center into workforce....CTE \$ hiring a job placement officer....student services mission is different and don't have the same focus. The only way we can do the tracking is social security numbers .....how do we get the data.....there is an underlining assumption that is not true....transfer or work....in many ways our students do both.....most people don't understand CTE....Set aside funding for a third party to track ....really can't be done at the local level...needs to include federal tracking for students out of state...

4. Facilities.

Response: if we are going to be hiring full time faculty they need office space....the capacity load ratios are unrealistic for the current realities....and technology...ex advanced software and then the need new computers because the old ones can't run the new software.....same holds true for equipment...for many of our programs we are competing with proprietary schools who pay for clinicals .....will continue with apprenticeship program ....financial incentive businesses for clinicals, interns, placement

5. Marketing and Outreach.

Response: I don't know.....don't think they are working with K-12....DSN supposed to take inventory to bring together strengths of the colleges to promote pathways.....pieces are there .....who do the DSN report to and how are they evaluated....the central region had to work together because northern and southern California were getting all of the funds ....how are you going to help each other.....one size doesn't fit all.....unrealistic expectations of the DSN and the regions

6. Data and Metrics.

Response: state wide tracking mechanisms .....gainful employment should be tracked at the state level....never fully implemented because of law suits....if we are required to track, then Back to the point of mandates being given without the infrastructure to make it happen....the information would be extremely valuable, but we don't have access

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

7. Curriculum and Program Approval.

Response: need the region to help support the development of new curriculum ....centers for excellence needs to provide the data for labor market and other aspects.....chancellors offices needs to share well designed curriculum for programs and allow other colleges to individualize with less ritualization.....DSNs need to help businesses understand the difference between credit and not for credit, and the value to the students of credit.

**Region 8 – South Coast**

**1. Funding A.**

Funding for centers needs to be long term or categorical funding could be provided.

Higher fees could be charged for higher cost programs for things like welding gases, nursing programs etc.

Increased material fees for specific programs.

Differential funding tied to number of completers etc. so that there is an outcome metric for the funding.

Decentralizing counseling functions – put counselors into specific programs.

Analyze impact to the economy and tie it to funding in some way.

Categorical money target to specific disciplines.

Pass some of the cost to the students

Charge for units awarded through credit by exam – the time it takes to set up these exams in CTE areas can be much greater than in regular courses

**2. Funding B.**

This won't encourage us to change things

Having metrics in which to operate with this money would be helpful

If categorical, how long will it last?

**3. Personnel.**

Classified support is critical and lacking

DH's are doing much of the work – parking passes, taking minutes, sending out invites

Need staffing for placement and tracking functions

Career services reporting –should it report to instruction?

Need a good mechanism to assist in placement and tracking

Use SSSP for front end but use CTE categorical for the exit tracking

Should get credit for the training that we provide on the back end

**4. Facilities.**

Upgrades require ADA compliance and other issues that are very cost prohibitive

Statewide bond where point systems are higher for CTE buildings since these programs are placing students directly into jobs

Capacity-load ratios don't take ADA regulations into account

Handicapped parking requirements make things difficult

**5. Marketing and Outreach.**

Use DSN's to create marketing brochures

LAOCRC is going to fund templates for brochures

Using equity money for marketing efforts

What is the role of the DSN's? Where is the assessment, accountability etc.?

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

Need to evaluate the role of the DSN's

JPA between districts

Videos funding with student equity money

Having these centralized at the CO might be good and would include a salary surfer information

**6. Data and Metrics.**

Employment outcomes survey is probably the best

No tail end funding is available – this needs to be strengthened

Need help working with WIBS – needs to be more integrated, need more cooperation

No way to track transfer – no way to know if they eventually go to work

Need to better utilize the COE's

Need to be able to pull all of the pieces together

Need centralized way to track data

**7. Curriculum and Program Approval.**

COE's need to become more regional

CO to hiring staff in COE?

Similar approval process for non-credit CTE is needed – as partners we need to talk about this so that we don't have destructive competition

**9. Sectors and Regions.**

Need a different process for identifying sectors

Did not know the implications of identifying the sectors being identified

The identified sectors should not be the only sectors being funded

Need to have option to fund other sectors

**10. CIOs and Regional Consortia Planning.**

Regional approach is important

Need to have an opportunity for vetting ideas

Not good that faculty can bypass existing processes

An annual meeting of CIO's is a good idea – aligning activities and conferences

**11. Other.**

AB 86 structure for advisory committee doesn't seem right

7 member structure for funding seems to be not equitable in any way

Better alignment of structures is necessary

**Region 9 - Desert**

**1. Funding A.**

- a. How are we going to support credit? The assumption is that we need money to support CTE programs. What is the best way to receive the money?
- b. CTE/STEM FTES?
- c. Categorical?
- d. Discussion revolved around STEM equipment being very expensive. And would like to see increases in funding for STEM/CTE equipment.
- e. When looking at starting a new program, have to look at Perkins funding, which other programs already depend on. What about start-up funding for new programs.

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- f. CTE group has come together to make decisions that didn't necessarily in line with CIO group. Funding should not support these silos.

**2. Funding B.**

- a. Currently on treadmill of applying for grants.
- b. An issue of 3SP are the restrictions on spending, so we would need to be careful if looking at having CTE categorical funding. Concerns over performance based funding as well.
  - i. What about program discontinuance.
  - ii. Would be regionally based, and be distributed by regional consortium.
    - 1. Most agreed that local control would better serve the colleges, rather than have decisions made by a consortium.
  - iii. Who decides where the money goes; for which programs? Would need to consider the formula for expenditures. Again, start-up costs, maintenance, etc. Discussion on having the funds roll over.
  - iv. Will money continue to be there? What about money for faculty? When hiring, we need to be careful if the programs are categorically funded. Shifting into the base however, money could get lost, or used in negotiations. Costs of programs need to look at all operational costs, including facilities, equipment, maintenance, etc...
  - v. Concerns over how money is received, and the timelines on when to spend the money. Need time to develop and start up a program (2 years?), and plan over time.

**3. Personnel.**

- a. Would this fall under Student Services or Instruction?
- b. Some feel that this would be under student services, but this poses problems.
- c. Need position to work with internships, and work with faculty, so perhaps better under instruction.
- d. Discussion on cultural shifts to eliminate silos between CTE and Instruction.
- e. Most see a shared responsibility.
- f. What about tracking vs. placement?
  - i. IR component. Labor intensive in analyzing data.
  - ii. Need IR included in discussion with regard to funding. So much dependent upon research, should not be an after-thought.
- g. When looking at improving CTE, we need to look at career placement.
- h. Arguments support local control, however perhaps have IR duties at regional level.

**4. Facilities.**

- a. This is a problem. Some colleges have space issues, and if looking to move a program off site, can be expensive.
- b. Discussion on Substantive Change process when utilizing a facility off site. Having a stream-lined process would help.
- c. We need to have the ability to partner with industry and high schools, and to incentivize these relationships.

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

- d. Capacity-load ratios, Ed Code and Fire Code don't match. If we comply with Fire Code, we don't meet Ed Code, if we go by Ed Code, we could get shut down under Fire Code.

**5. Marketing and Outreach.**

- a. No colleges indicated that they have a marketing "plan."
- b. Some colleges are utilizing a marketing company for ad hoc work.
- c. Some consortiums are developing a brochure for programs.
- d. Need marketing money for both college and regional marketing. Agreed two-pronged approach necessary.
- e. COD using model used by their Foundation for outreach (Edge Program).
- f. Branding important, highlighting CTE, not just transfer – highlight specific industry training.
- g. Bilingual approach also helpful.
- h. Discussion on role of committees in developing marketing plans (e.g. enrollment management committee).
- i. Discussion on growth/marketing plans that incorporate recession plans.
- j. Instruction and Student Services must work together for enrollment management (scheduling, facilities usage, etc.). Need to build those relationships.

**6. Data and Metrics.**

- a. Discussed need for placement data. Many colleges are using EDD and State Chancellor's office to capture placement data, as well as surveys to alumni.
- b. Need to address how success is measured? Those that take a few courses to advance in the career, or get a new job, and do, should be counted as a success. There are those colleges that have certificates of preparation, or stackable courses. Still, need to track those that take a couple of courses and advanced in their career or obtained employment of a result.
- c. "Cross-walking" programs with employment data, living wages for the community, projections, etc. would be helpful. If this type of information were available for all colleges from the regions or state level could help as well. College of the Desert has done this at their college.

**7. Curriculum and Program Approval.**

- a. Advisory committee meetings can be vibrant, but concerns over need for jobs/skills two years later. Discussion on scheduling off regular schedule grid, to allow for completion of a certificate quickly. That said, the development of a program can take a year and a half, at least, to have an approved program through curriculum, A & R, and catalog constituencies. Some colleges have "addendum points" for CTE courses/programs.
- b. Discussion on knowing what Sector Navigators are doing, what are the various initiatives? What are they supposed to be doing, are they visiting the various campuses. DSNs report to the Chancellors Office. Many CIOs are concerned that they are on the sidelines. DSNs are moving into curriculum arena. There is a regional CTE consortium, website, with minutes available. Michael Reiner, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, Riverside Community College District will research the DSN responsibilities/expectations, and follow up with the Vice Chancellor over these

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

initiatives at the Chancellor’s Office to better understand the regional consortium. There was discussion on not having statewide curriculum that can be taken “off the shelf” and used by individual colleges. Discussion on need of having “pre-approved” programs.

- c. The Academic Affairs staff has identified a number of problems. There may be some issues with the curriculum repository, as well as staffing turnover at the college level, whereby problems with curriculum get submitted to Chancellor’s Office. The number of elements having to be reviewed, multiplied by the number of colleges is somewhat daunting. They have made some changes to the elements to help speed the process. CurricuNet is being discussed. MIS doesn’t connect with all the work taking place with curriculum. It is going to take 18 months to get through everything, and in meantime colleges are using various systems with regard to curriculum. These systems will need to work together. Discussion on having a professional development event bringing curriculum specialists from the colleges together to review programs and certificates for approval at the Chancellor’s office.

**8. Faculty and DSNs.**

- a. Due to some lack of understanding and involvement of the DSN with CIOs, it was difficult to identify how DSNs are working with faculty.
- b. As noted above, are the DSNs visiting the campuses? This could help to better disseminate information.

**9. Sectors and Regions.**

**10. To what extent should Regional Consortia also focus on steady-growth/good wage sectors, particularly when allocating enhanced CTE funding?**

- a. Advanced manufacturing is working well in LA/Orange County; Public Safety has recently met.
- b. Program approval process is working with the consortium, so having that level of participation for DSN initiatives might be helpful.
- c. Center of Excellence. If we could learn more about what they do, and what we can learn from them.
- d. Still want to work at the local level, with regional discussion.
- e. Discussion on CTE LaunchBoard. Confusion on responsibility for capturing and reporting information on momentum points

**11. CIOs and Regional Consortia Planning.**

- a. CTE work is being done without the CIOs. CIOs need to be at the table.
- b. Craig is currently on the task force, we have one seat. So much has been done prior to CIO involvement.
- c. There are workload issues. We have all these various initiatives tied to numerous funding sources. How are we supposed to keep up?
- d. We need money to staff in order to keep track of these initiatives.
- e. How to we provide leadership of CTE initiatives/responsibilities.

**12. Other.** What other comments do you have regarding the Task Force’s work?

- i. No additional dialogue.

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCIO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

**Region 10 – San Diego/Imperial**

**1. Funding A.**

Compensate CTE programs at a higher rate. Garner more funding to institutionalize CTE programs, fund high cost equipment, etc. Thus, a higher apportionment rate for CTE, say 30% higher, is a good idea. Better to keep STEM and CTE independent to not mix federal funding streams and lose, e.g., the CTE focus of Perkins. We need two pots of money, one for STEM and one for CTE. CTE equipment is very expensive and requires constant upgrades to maintain currency with industry standards. Perkins is only for establishing programs and has a three-year limitation. We need a way to institutionalize programs. Additional funding is also required to establish new programs for emerging industries and technologies.

**2. Funding B.**

Concerns: how will this funding differ in terms of oversight, reporting requirements, and time frame or funding period? Will this be better than the current model? Why would good personnel hire on to administer a grant when they know they will lose their position in two years when the grant ends? Wish list: connect basic skills, student equity, SSSP, and CTE to wrap services around students, provide them contextualized instruction and a promise of a job when they leave, similar to programs to support athlete-scholars.

**3. Personnel.**

Campus versus regional approach? What is the role of the WIB to place CTE graduates? A functional WIB can be a strong asset in a region. Once we have a good model, then funding can follow.

**4. Facilities.**

Leased spaces may not work in all regions—one size does not fit all. It's difficult to generate enough FTES from CTE courses to pay for leases. Even when programs are grant-funded, when the grant runs out, we can't afford the lease anymore, so programs are not sustainable. For fee-based programs, this may work. Leased facilities are nice because we don't own them once programs end. There are accreditation implications when programs move to new sites. Bottom line: For CTE programs, we need funding to begin them and to sustain them.

**5. Marketing and Outreach.**

SNs and DSNs form an overlapping bureaucracy to district and college administration and regional consortia; they do not report to CIOs. CIOs are often left out of the information loop regarding their efforts. The SNs and DSNs should be taking the marketing lead to industry, but we really don't know what their roles are. We are probably duplicating efforts and wasting resources. The communication structure needs to be improved and should clarify the role of navigators, to include CIOs, deans. There needs to be some accountability from the navigator group to the instructional group. Regional CIOs should have copies of all seven regional plans, and SNs/DSNs should attend CIO meetings to report on their goals and efforts.

**6. Data and Metrics.**

We are lucky in San Diego/Imperial to have a Center of Excellence that provides us data. We need data associated with two- and four-year college graduates and where they find employment after graduation. We need a simple way to track students after graduation. It should be statewide.

**7. Curriculum and Program Approval.**

We need to hire a separate person or two in the chancellor's office to handle CTE curricula,

**REGIONAL CONVERSATIONS WITH CIOs**  
**CCCCO SPRING CONFERENCE – REGIONAL BREAKOUTS**  
**APRIL 16, 2015**

especially as we have to review CTE curricula every two (not six) years. Put together a subcommittee to figure out exactly what is needed and how we can streamline processes. We need a stronger connection at CCCCCO between instruction and CTE divisions so there is more understanding of the needs of each, to streamline processes, and to coordinate better.

**8. Faculty and DSNs.**

DSNs are talking to faculty and even providing funding, but CIOs and curriculum chairs are left out. When it comes time for CIOs to deal with issues that arise, they have no information or background to solve the problems. We need more communication and coordination. We need a single source of information, given to CIOs rather than CTE deans or faculty.

**9. Sectors and Regions.**

**10. CIOs and Regional Consortia Planning.**

Rather than doing what you think matters and telling us about it, why not first ask us what we think matters and let us help determine the course of the initiative? We need regular updates from CCCCCO about any initiatives and changes before the SNs and DSNs. We need a voice in developing all initiatives. This is the most important of the 10 questions here. This feedback has been provided multiple times and is a common thread throughout all 10 questions.