I. Call to Order; Welcome and Introductions
Chairperson Lorraine Slattery-Farrell called the meeting to order at 10:15 AM in conference room 601 at the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and welcomed the members of the committee, noting that Gail Zwart from Norco is new to the committee.

Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, CTELC Chairperson
Curtis Stage, Los Angeles Mission College
Don Hopkins, Folsom Lake College
Gail Zwart, Norco College
John Freitas, Los Angeles City College
Jolena Grande, Cypress College
Jon Krupp, San Joaquin Delta College
Katherine Krolikowski, Contra Costa College
Marne Foster, San Diego Continuing Education
Robert Cabral, Oxnard College
Toni Parsons, San Diego Mesa College
Julie Adams, ASCCC

II. Approval of the Agenda
Lorraine asked Jolena to take notes during the meeting and mentioned that she will be sending out the minutes from the conference call in November and asked for any additions to the agenda. Robert would like to add a discussion item: “Curriculum Streamlining Process” to the agenda.

III. Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)
None.

IV. Update on Strong Workforce Program & Recommendations
a. Lorraine, John F and Julie A provided the group an update on the ongoing efforts on the Workforce Taskforce
Lorraine mentioned that ASCCC Committees has worked on elements of the Strong Workforce Program. The CCCCO DoingWhatMatters page has a spreadsheet of what has been accomplished to date, and is through the lens of what the CCCO believes has been achieved to date, and may not necessarily reflect what ASCCC believes has been accomplished.

b. Committee members shared reports from advisory group assignments
Katie is on 5C, and has attended one meeting to date, with another meeting being cancelled. ADT were a large topic of conversation, and what kind of leverage to use with the CSUs. The new curriculum approval system was discussed, and that a cut-off date would need to be implemented. The local level will now be able to approve and the
Chancellor’s Office will be a repository for the course outlines of record. The regional consortiums will be a part of the process. Robert reported on “Process One” that is following the North Far North Consortium model. There will be workshops rolling out to help faculty take the lead on this pathway. John Freitas reported that the curriculum committee will be doing workshops on the new local approval processes. The North Far North is suggesting that the curriculum approval process be reduced from 6 months to 3 months (from initiation to board approval). The process is dependent on local processes.

There was concern expressed about how the process may be rolled out state wide from the pilot in the North Far North. It is important that we retain one curriculum process for all curriculum, and not a separate process for CTE curriculum.

Katie also mentioned the cross-walking between SOC, CIP, and TOP, which spawned a conversation about what makes a CTE course a CTE course, and how a transfer course leads to the same occupational outcomes (biotech program using biotech class versus molecular biology).

Lorraine and John Freitas, along with Don and Jolena, are on the Minimum Qualification taskforce/Equivalency Advisory Committee – which has met 3 times and has written a paper on effective practices, and will come out with a white paper later in the spring with more definitive information. They are looking at bringing together discipline faculty to determine what may be appropriate for specific disciplines. They will look at discipline professional standards, rather than looking at one size (6 years experience) fits all. Toni asked about new disciplines being added for emerging areas, especially in CTE.

Robert reported on C-ID DIGs (last one was in December) and the next layer of disciplines will be determined and report out later.

c. **More and Better CTE project update**

CCCAOE is taking on trainings at a local level with the goal to do 30 regional trainings for CIOs, CEOs, faculty, and others. ASCCC CTELC will participate when more information is available.

V. **CTE Regional Consortia Meetings and Representation**

a. **Members will be asked to report on their regional consortia**

Marne reported on the regional consortium meeting in November that she attended in San Diego. The San Diego Continuing Education CTE Liaison serving on that committee is serving with Marne. The main topic of discussion was focused on the Strong workforce proposal plan for the region. Workforce readiness and research on best practices are two projects that are being funded. Some colleges will receive one time funds to colleges from the regional allocation. They are focusing on pathways and marketing CTE with common branding. There are faculty on that committee working to determine the projects that the region is undertaking.

Chad reported (in written form) from North Far North that their regional consortium set
target goals for enrollments and awards. They are seeking employer input on possible projects for the region. There was little or no faculty input. Don reported that a high def simulator that is within a tractor trailer (portable) is being considered.

Gail reported on the regional consortium in her area (Norco/Riverside/Desert) that began with faculty and deans, along with presidents and CIOs, and workforce development. The group developed guiding principles for how to sift through the hundred+ proposals. The CTE deans took the guiding principles to determine which proposals to send forward. Some were funded, but at lower amounts. The proposals sent forward to everyone for review in the region. The next meeting, January 23, the executive committee will reconvene and vet the proposals and guiding principles. The process went well according to Gail. Placement and clinical site coordinator for nursing will be considered, regional pathway, feasibility study for logistics, incubator, accelerated placement program, regional marketing, and pilot project for regional advisory committee.

Katie reported on the Bay Area Regional Consortium meeting and their processes of regional projects.

Lorraine will follow up with the regional consortium chairs to make certain that faculty are allowed (and invited) to attend, especially for the CTE liaisons.

Jon reported on the Central Valley/Motherlode region, and is a very large region. He reported that the area makes it difficult to get faculty to cover attendance. Faculty may be hesitant to attend future meetings because there was not a lot of structure to the regional consortium.

Robert reported on the regional consortium steering committee, that includes two faculty members (voting). There is some discussion that regional consortiums may be able to support the CTE liaisons. Maybe provide funding for reassigned time.

b. Members will review consortia calendar and ensure representation

VI. Resolutions from F16 assigned to the committee

a. Resolutions from CTELC

Resolution 17.02 S15 Establishing CTE Liaisons
Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to identify a CTE faculty member to act as a liaison to facilitate communication among local CTE faculty, the local academic senate, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

Resolution 18.04 S16 Increase Awareness of High School Articulation Resources
Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to increase awareness of the Career and Technology Education Management Application (CATEMA) resources and to make better use of the data.
Resolution 21.01 F16 Faculty Participation in Career Technical Education Regional Consortia Governance

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the career technical education (CTE) regional consortium governance models required by the Strong Workforce Program must include faculty as active and voting members;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that local senates should recommend the faculty identified to be potential members of CTE regional consortium governance bodies; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that the CTE regional consortia provide sufficient resources to enable faculty appointed by the local senates to participate fully in the activities of their governance bodies.

Resolution 21.02 F16 Identify and Disseminate Effective Practices for Career Technical Advisory Committees

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges distribute a survey to member colleges by Spring 2017 to identify examples of effective practices for career and technical education (CTE) advisory committees used by CTE programs throughout California’s community colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges identify and disseminate effective practices for career technical education (CTE) advisory committees and present it at the Fall 2017 plenary session for adoption.

There was discussion of collecting local processes, including Gail and Curtis’s best practices, from the CTELC members.

We need to ask CTE liaisons to forward us their practices and then the CTELC can compile the results. Lorraine will send an email and also through listserv. We also need to ask industry about what is most valuable in serving on the advisory committee.

Resolution 21.03 F16 Institute for Counseling Faculty Focused on Career Technical Education

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide an institute for counseling faculty focused on career technical education.

We will add a strand to the leadership institute for counselors. There was discussion about providing funding to send counselors to the institute. Lorraine will be asking Von Ton Quinlivan for additional resources. For those colleges without a CTE focused counselor, they should be encouraged to send their general counselors.

Resolution 21.04 F16 Career Technical Education Professional Development for Faculty internships and Mentoring

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a module in its Professional Development College that supports diverse industry professionals with a pathway to becoming career technical education (CTE) faculty interns; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a module in its Professional Development College that supports faculty in mentoring diverse CTE faculty interns.
Julie Adams reported on the development of an outline for faculty orientation and includes a section for industry professionals to become interested in teaching.

**Resolution 21.05 F16 Support for Career Technical Education Programs**

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local colleges to include the voice of career technical education (CTE) faculty in the allocation and distribution of the Strong Workforce Program funding to ensure support for CTE programs including internships, guest lectures, employment of faculty, equipment purchases, facilities upgrades, and participation on regional advisory boards.

There was discussion about having ASCCC President write a letter to CIOs to encourage them to have faculty participate in the planning process.

There was a suggestion that we have a module on how faculty can assert their Academic Senate voice. A soft skills toolkit was forwarded by Jon.

**b. Referred to Committee - Resolution 21.06 F16**

**Whereas,** The Board of Governors approved the Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy Report and Recommendations, [1] including Recommendation 14.f., which states that the California Community College system should “Convene representative apprenticeship teaching faculty, labor organizations, and other stakeholders to review the appropriateness of minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors”;

**Whereas,** Apprenticeship instruction leads to high-wage, high-skill careers for nearly 100% of enrolled students; and

**Whereas,** Education Code §87357 states that for minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors the Board of Governors “shall consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, appropriate apprenticeship teaching faculty and labor organizations [from the relevant industries]”;  

**Resolved,** That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the efforts of the apprenticeship teaching faculty and labor organizations from the relevant industries in the development of minimum qualifications as specified in Education Code §87357.

This resolution has been assigned to standards and practices the CTELC. The minimum qualifications for apprenticeship faculty gives primary reliance to the labor organization. John Freitas mentioned that there is not much that can be done with this resolution at this point.

There is a request for CTELC feedback on this item. After discussion of the proposed language in the referred resolution from fall plenary session. We will need to bring in industry experts to help with the drafting of the language if this resolution is revised.
Katie reported (and sent an email) regarding Kaiser hospital in Richmond offering associate degrees in medical assisting.

VII. **CTE Leadership Institute Planning - May 5 & 6**
Jon compiled a list of potential topics that include:
- SWP
- Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency Advisory
- Regional Consortium
- Centers of excellence
- Program discontinuance processes
- Data/launchboard

There was a discussion of potential General Sessions: Strong workforce program; data sources and effective uses

There was a discussion of potential Breakout sessions:
- Several suggestions for sessions were discussed
- High school bridging to CTE programs
- How to get the academic senate involved in the local share programs/proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership/ governance/senate</th>
<th>Strong workforce</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Counseling and CTE pathways/dual enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum qualifications/equivalency</td>
<td>Sector navigators/DSN</td>
<td>Regional consortia</td>
<td>Accelerated career education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating MQs and equivalency – case studies</td>
<td>Regional consortia</td>
<td>Advisory board</td>
<td>AA/AS requirements (GE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory boards</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>Contextualized basic skills</td>
<td>Bridge programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program discontinuance/reinvention/transitioning</td>
<td>Funding- SWP and Perkins, other sources</td>
<td>AA/AS requirements</td>
<td>Noncredit to credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCCC 101</td>
<td>C-ID and model awards</td>
<td>Dual enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet soup...TOP/CIP/SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling/CTE partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a liaison...now what?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. **Spring Plenary Planning**
Lorraine asked that we send her any resolutions that are being proposed

a. **Proposed breakout sessions**
   - Using your cte liaison
   - Understanding cte funding (SWP, Perkins)

b. **CTE liaison engagement opportunity**

IX. **Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m. Information for the next conference call will be sent out by Lorraine.