

Conference Call Minutes from August 31, 2007

Wilma Owens
Lynne Ornelas
Otto Lee
Al Taccone
Stan Schroeder
Mary Wylie
Daria Davis
Trudy Gerald
Jean Kaput
Michelle Turner
Charlene Atkins
Madelaine Wolfe
Chuck Wiseley

Tech Prep:

Tech Prep in place for two years. July 1, 2008 in second year of set aside. LA/Orange reinforce that this is a good thing that we get the set aside. Minimum for three years. Enough time to gather data and preserve set aside for another year. CDE and CCCCO agree to just have set aside for two years. Evaluating before we meet the standards on how can we do that when we are on the first year of the plan to be able to make any recommendations. Not only articulation but also programs of study. Three year pilot is the recommendation from Mary Wylie, Lynne Ornelas. This would allow us enough time to get the data and information for review. According to Lynne, San Diego is the model. Stan mentioned that the plan only is two years but push for at least three years but go for five years. Otto stated that we agree with them with the structure but have more time to get assessment data. Lynne stated that we have a regional structure to gather data. Stan suggested Lynne would be ideal to provide testimony for San Diego/Imperial Counties – next Friday at 9am. Diana is willing to go to provide testimony for special populations. State of California must respond to all testimony that is submitted. Wilma stated that she wrote out her testimony and then submit it afterwards. Jean will work with Lynne regarding writing the testimony for Tech Prep. Stan mentioned to look at the resources from the Regional Consortium website for additional information to strengthen testimony.

Split of funds:

Stan stated that the enrollment has dramatically declined in enrollment however the split remains the same. Split should be adjusted based on enrollments. Wilma stated that the overall enrollment declined in K-12. Madelaine stated that a decline in High Schools is that they are no longer offering the CTE courses. Lynne stated that the other issue is that Tech Prep is run through the community colleges which drive the initiatives and such in the state of California. Stan asked what would be the basis for the split. Mary stated that she would be willing to look at this issue if they have more information about the reasoning behind the split. Defer to Ron and Chuck about what factual arguments. Do we have a basis regarding the split besides the enrollment numbers? Chuck mentioned that we are using enrollment numbers and the cost to run a CTE program at the High School. Chuck recommended that we submit a similar statement like LA/Orange regarding that California will re-evaluate of the split based on enrollment data be

Conference Call Minutes from August 31, 2007

built into the Perkins IV Plan or revisit the split once the data is in. Lynne asked if we recommend what has already been stated in LA/Orange. Stan mentioned that the role of community colleges to address the response to workforce may need to be added to this issue. Chuck mentioned that workforce training that is going on in community colleges costs more and that with more students coming to us then we get more of the split. Lower enrollments are attributed to a younger student base and the current workforce not returning to us for retraining. The split of funds is based on counts of vocational students and how they are coded with a vocational TOP Code or SAM Code. CDE is doing the same thing with their coding. Recommendation that we re-evaluate now and again in four years. Jean will speak on split of funds. Stan stated that we need to have on the record that the reevaluation will be put into the plan. Wilma mentioned that not only to have the reevaluation into the plan but to state that we need to ensure that we get an equitable split of funds.

Accountability:

Chuck stated that the state would provide colleges with 5 years of past data to assist them with making their decision with negotiating performance levels. Lynne inquired when we would get the data. Chuck is working with MIS. Chuck mentioned that we need to have ongoing training regarding how to negotiate the state levels and be accurate. Stan mentioned that one provision of new Perkins IV is that the state plan should address this issue with ongoing training and assistance.

Stan inquired if anyone else was going to the hearings. Chuck mentioned that the online comments have just as much weight. Chuck mentioned that we should encourage others to utilize the online information and participate in the discussions. Diversifying our strategy to get more comments and testimony both online and in person. Chuck Wiseley stated that the written testimony will be evaluated the same way as the testimony given at the Public Hearings. Al suggested sending a testimony template to faculty in Word document form for them to use. To submit comments: <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/ctep/create/ctefb>

Chapter 1 & 2 – state of the State

Chapter 3 – what we are going doing now and in the future

Chapter 4 – responds to the federal guidelines

Programs of Study:

Stan referred to the LA/Orange statements regarding the programs of study which include:

- Community colleges do not have an issue with program of study but the K-12s do.
- What is the time frame for schools to have a program of study in place?
- It is time to align programs of study and require the same requirements for funding.
- Suggestion: Perhaps a need for regional approval for program development in the K-12 and ROP programs. This would require a look at labor market data when developing a new program.

Conference Call Minutes from August 31, 2007

Mary inquired if the Program of Study is by school or district in order to receive Perkins funds. Lynne mentioned that San Diego Unified stated that any school involved in ROP must participate in the program of study in order to receive Perkins funding. Mary will look into this issue and possibly provide comment. Chuck urged her to look within Chapter 4 for more information and responses. Chuck mentioned that we haven't discussed setting leadership funds aside to assist with putting these programs of study in place instead of just business as usual. Chuck suggested that we need to ensure that the program of study is addressed in the state plan and aligning career pathways.

Special Populations:

Stan mentioned that there are no specific activities related to improving services to Special Populations and that we also ask the Special Populations Committee to come up with more specific suggestions. Stan suggested having Laurie Harrison make recommendations regarding special population's students. Mary mentioned that when we created the special populations issue paper that we wanted a mandatory assessment written into the plan regarding how we are addressing the needs of special population's students. Mary mentioned that if the core indicators are not met for all career technical programs not just those funded with VTEA would lose funding. Chuck mentioned that if we did not meet the targets we could lose VTEA funding. He stated that it depends on how well your college collects the data. Stan mentioned to continue to sponsor JSPAC and more specificity on how to collect data regarding the special population's students. Stan will contact Laurie Harrison to assist with providing testimony regarding this issue. Otto suggested shifting the focus on an institutional commitment on how to address this issue and how to support it instead of relying only on faculty. Chuck stated that we could use the Student Learning Outcomes as a model.

Chuck mentioned that the state needs to provide funding for accountability and special populations.