

Industry Driven Regional Collaborative Meeting
May 10, 2001
Customer Service/Call Center

Participants:

- Bernadette Black, Cuyamaca College
- Nancy Fredricks, Southwestern College
- Kay Hartig, Cuyamaca College
- Teresa McNeil, Cuyamaca College
- Stan Schroeder, Grossmont College
- Joy Talbergs, MiraCosta College
- Mary Wylie, Southwestern College
- Anthony Zambelli, Cuyamaca College

Mary Wylie indicated she spoke with Lois Bruhn to contact Jim Smith from Continuing Education if he would be interested in participating in the collaborative, however has not heard back from her.

Teresa distributed draft copies of the grant application's abstract, narrative and budget sheet for the committee's review. She indicated that the grant requirements were lengthy and asked the group if they had any language to include in the application. She stated some of the information was obtained through the curriculum. The group suggested to add the ten training topics listed in the narrative to the abstract. Mary suggested stating in the grant application that "we were exposed through this idea through Train the Trainer and members of collaboratives, and since we had a Call Center serving East County, it seemed appropriate to build upon it." She also mentioned to "talk about industry clusters and service to existing workforce." Mary believed that this would sell this project."

Suggestions for the Grant Application:

- Nancy Fredricks reiterated "the focus of this project was set up for businesses and the workplace, and to work through Chambers to take customer service to communities to improve business training."
- Mary stated that "there is nothing in the narrative that says why we need this regional money, and how we can use this Customer Service Center." She indicated also to mention that the project would build on collaborative relationships. Stan Schroeder liked that idea and added, "bringing in partner colleges and partner business associations." Mary indicated that Pacific Waste Services showed interest in the Customer Service Academy.
- Kay wanted to confirm that the focus will be delivered in a non-credit mode, and Stan mentioned that that was stated in the second paragraph of the narrative statement.
- Mary suggested mentioning that the project would be implemented region-wide, targeting industry clusters. She also added that showing how we would be using

resources (i.e. CACT, REBRAC, and any ED>Net initiatives) might enhance our chances. Stan mentioned to include SDICCCA as well.

- Tony Zambelli emphasized that “one of the goals of this project is that people will look at us for training rather than outside entities.” He also stated that a sentence needed to be added in the narrative statement on what we would do to leverage each other. Tony stated that “the thrust of this project is not technical, but rather more soft skills.”
- Mary indicated that this project would “open doors” for other kinds of training. She further stated that “we are taking a well thought out modularized program and offering a regional approach.” The goal would be to disseminate on how we did that, and Kay indicated that the Regional Consortium could be utilized as a source.
- Kay asked the group to obtain letters of support for match from businesses and bring them to the next meeting. Each college will in turn match \$30,000.

Application Budget Detail Sheet

- The committee reviewed each object code and line items on the budget sheet. Kay explained that on the Application Budget Detail Sheet, a “C” was placed next to items that represented the “Call Center” and an “A” represented the “Customer Service Academy.” She clarified that placing the letters next to each item was used for internal information only. Kay indicated the budget information included both the Call Center and Customer Service Academy. Mary showed some concern about including the Call Center, as she believed it would seem like we were just trying to add on. Kay suggested putting more focus on expansion. Tony explained, “half of what we do is Customer Service training already.” However, Mary stated that any reference to the Call Center “muddies the water” in this particular grant. She suggested emphasizing in the grant application that the Customer Service Academy would be utilized regionally, and that there is no interest to duplicate the Call Center. Further indicate that the Call Center is a small effort for East County only.
- Kay mentioned that we identified \$150,000 for the Call Center and \$150,000 for the Customer Service Academy. The first year of the project is 9 ½ months, beginning on September 12, 2001, and the second year is 12 months.
- Nancy agreed to help Bill Gray in Staff Development/Train the Trainer workshops.
- Mary reiterated to use the terms “leverage” and “collaboratives” when preparing the application. Stan also mentioned that to reinforce collaborative, we should have a collaborative team or Steering committee as an avenue for colleges to meet to plan and implement the project. Teresa affirmed that a Regional Advisory Committee was included in the proposal.

- Kay asked if each campus would have a liaison as a central resource to implement the project, and Mary suggested using the term “Customer Service Academy Coordinator” rather than liaison. Nancy thought that each college would conduct direct marketing. Tony replied that a selected team would be best for joint marketing purposes. Mary stated that each college should have their own representative, but use same materials for a unified look. She agreed that one person should be in charge of marketing. Mary also suggested the possibility of hiring a marketing firm.
- Kay asked if we needed to include Software Licenses, and Tony mentioned that there is software out there to test people’s attitude. Mary recommended including Software in the second year of the grant, which was agreed upon by the group.
- Tony indicated that Postage and Media Advertising costs could go up in the Budget.
- Mary recommended planning a luncheon for all community leaders, and suggested calling it “Industry Launch.”
- It was suggested that if we were hurting for money, to include some items only in the second year. Stan noticed that in the 5000 object code, items were counted twice; therefore, opening up \$50,000. The group suggested putting \$35,000 for Videos, and \$10,000 for Media. Mary and Joy both agreed that the Community College Coordinators cost be increased to \$6,000.
- Tony indicated that media is very expensive and not as effective as personal contact, and stated that it might be better to “up the marketing side on the personal contact level.” Stan replied that there will be industry partners, however, Tony mentioned that that’s not the mechanism that works the best. Nancy stated that the media has to be community wide.

Corrections/Additions:

OBJECT CODE 1000

- ❑ Grant Administrator should be both “C” and “A”.
- ❑ Staff Development/Train the Trainer Workshops – 60 hours rather than 50 hours (to include re-evaluations).

OBJECT CODE 2000

- ❑ Secretary—19 hours for Call Center and 6 hours for Customer Service Academy=25 hours.

OBJECT CODE 5000

- ❑ Add (s) to Marketer.
- ❑ Kay mentioned that Web Designer should be included in the 5000 object code.
- ❑ Mary stated that Staff Development/Train the Trainer workshops should also be included in the 5000 object code.

- ❑ Mary suggested excluding the following line items from the Budget sheet: Alarm System, Contract Custodial, and Contract, Copier/Maintenance.
- ❑ The group suggested putting \$35,000 for Videos, and \$10,000 for Media. Mary and Joy both agreed that the Community College Coordinators cost be increased to \$6,000.

Miscellaneous

- Mary asked the group if we wanted go in with any other major partners as part of this collaborative (i.e. Workforce Partnerships, San Diego Employer's Association; Human Resources; San Diego EDC. etc.) to enhance our chances. She further stated that this partnership would be "in collaboration with the Customer Service Academy." Stan liked this idea because it was a regional approach. Mary reiterated that in partnering with EDC, the support would come through match, not funds (i.e. listing us as collaborators). Joy also liked the idea of getting involved with the workforce. It was agreed that Chambers would not be included.
- Stan agreed to contact Deanna Weeks at the East County EDC; Joy agreed to contact North County EDC; and Mary agreed to contact the South EDC. Tony asked if it was detrimental that we were doing this without San Diego EDC and the group agreed that we could pass on San Diego EDC.
- Kay indicated that the group would need to obtain letters of support from businesses. Stan mentioned that he would get a letter from San Diego Employer's Association. Joy stated she would contact Manpower for a letter of support. Mary suggested offering a template for employers to follow when preparing the letter.
- Stan mentioned that some of the grant application RFAs stated not to attach letters of support. However, it was clarified that the letters the group would be obtaining were not letters of support, rather letters of match.
- Stan also stated that we needed a way to share among the group best vendors and best prices, and suggested starting a listserv, which he agreed to put together.
- Next meeting: May 24th. The group agreed to bring their letters of support they received from businesses.
- **Grant applications are due June 21, 2001.**