AEBG Consortium Meeting 5-19-16 AVC HS194

Present: Ed Knudson, President AVC; Steve Radford, AVUHSD/AVAS - Director; Sally Dibbini, AVUHSD/AVAS Coordinator; Greg Nehen, Asst. Sup. Ed Services, AVUHSD; Ann Steinberg, Placement Dir. AVC; Les Uhazy, Dean AVC; Tom O'Neil, Dean AVC; Sharon Dalmage, Dir. AVC Palmdale Ctr.; Lori Gilroy, YouthBuild and AVC Wildland Fire adjunct; Diane Walker, College & Career Readiness Coordinator, AVUHSD; PJ Del Gaudio, AVC, GAVEA; Harold Roney, Debi Keys, and Bob Jones arrive at 10:12am

Steve Radford asks at 10:08am whether we should proceed without Rosamond. They did not request a call-in. Les Uhazysays it is difficult to hear on the line. Sharon Dalmage notes if it is in a room with conference call facilities, it might be easier in the future. The CCC Confer pass code was provided in the agenda. They texted Debi Keys and she says she's on her way. Ed Knudson says that Room 140 and his conference room have capabilities, and will be upgraded during the summer, also.

Agenda item IV - Proposal Template Review: Ed notes that the format of the proposal was not easy to read; Steve agreed – we will have to address it. He asks whether it could be individual submissions, and Sharon says they will tweak it. Ed says one could use 8.5 x 14, with all columns on one sheet which would allow it to go to multiple sheets. Sally Dibbini feels the regular proposal form was easier to read. Sally would like to see a grand total for the proposal cost. Diane Walker suggests having an entry for which plan goal the proposal addresses. Steve asks for estimated number of students served by the program. Steve responds to Ed's question that the template is to begin the process, so anyone from outside could put in a proposal for X services and request funding, and then the consortium members consider them for approval. Sharon says there is a link on the website for a fillable form, which she pulls up - Document Archive tab at avadulteducation.avc.edu - Proposal Request Form. The input goes into the Google Sheet; Ed suggests speaking to Greg for assistance with tweaking the format.

This is the first time the consortium has undertaken this process, so Steve wonders if all should be reviewed first and then vote. At some point, the members must vote (one vote per member institution). Tom O'Neil suggests going through each category's proposal for comparison. Ed suggests having a review committee go through and rank for each category, have a conversation, and then vote; it could delay the process, however. For all participants to discuss each one would be cumbersome. Steve is open to that process. Sharon felt that it would minimize the discussion by sending out the proposals in advance for review; Ed agrees, however, there would be multiple opinions during a discussion. The review committee is a process the college uses. Greg Nehen agrees,

with the addition of a list of pros, cons, and additional comments to bring back to the committee as a whole.

Sally asks whether it might be valuable for each submitting agency to summarize their proposals first. Greg asks whether the decision needs to be made today. Sharon opines we need to get money spent. Steve says it's a three-year window, but we need direction for 16-17 programs. Tom asks about conducting the process through e-mail. Ann Steinberg asks about creating a ranking form. What criteria would be used? Number of students served? Ed needs to have things on one sheet first to read on the screen, and Tom says the program category needs to be easily accessible. Sharon says that if the voting members are not going to do so today, then she can adjust the form before-hand and send it out again by tomorrow morning. Each member gets one vote. Tom wonders whether there should be consensus. Bonnie Suderman and Ed met with Steve and Harold Roney yesterday and talked through some things. Things are coming to a head with prison education, part of which would be adult education to prevent recidivism for adults with illiteracy. There is capacity on-campus for CTE programs and other rooms for Basic Skills at night (struggle for faculty in the latter area). If they could create enhanced basic skills, enhanced non-credit, with academic specialists rather than master's degree level teaching the courses, they might be able to do more. It may be that outside facilities are not needed as much. Ed says that in working with Harold over the last two years, they have developed a program that assists young people in college and career readiness. Ed says extending the funds rather than running into each other is the goal. Having a brick and mortar facility, whether renting or owning, could be problematic, but probably need some type of additional space. He would like to read these in conjunction with other things they have. The college doesn't need rent for space, but needs help with faculty to teach the classes. They can support the Maintenance of Effort piece, and wouldn't need lots of funding from the consortium if they can get the apportionment for the basic skills classes. AVC is impacted until 3pm daily, but could help in the evening. They could assist with apprenticeship, child care, etc., for working adults in the evening. There are lots of silos of money, however, they don't always know what each other is doing. The new CTE trailer bill provides for $200 million in on-going funding from Doing What Matters, with 40% to regional consortia, and 60% to the community colleges. AVC's share is $1.2 million to $1.5 million, over two to three years; it could help buy equipment. Match that with other grants and the AEBG and that becomes $15 million pretty quickly.

Steve says he spoke with Richard Verches, head of the LA County WDB, this morning, and he said they may be able to add funding, as well. Ed says WIOA will probably add in, too. In four years, there may not be funding, but we need to use what's available now. WIOA metrics and follow-up will be key; we may need to spend some money on data collection. EDD is the only one who can tie in by

social security number, and they are expensive to access. The last time he did it for the nursing program was $96,000 to follow up with 120 students.

Steve asks about how the review board would work. Ed says it's a peer review process, where they go through the proposals and they are prioritized, see how they fit with those from other agencies, and get input. AVC is only teaching two levels below transfer. Harold seconds that proposal; have two from each site (member) on the sub-committee. Ed and Steve both agree with that. Then they get tossed in the pool. That is the way the Feds do it, Chancellor's Office, etc. Steve feels there is an expressed rationale for the project. Ed notes it keeps it more objective and less political. Ann asks about some sort of appeal or re-review process in the event a proposal is not accepted. Bob Jones says part of the ranking could be a request for additional information. The group agrees. Ed says that he could come up with those selection criteria and scoring mechanism with Harold and Steve. There is probably a model to use, per Steve. Workforce Development at the Chancellor's Office has a rubric to score RFA's for competitive grants. Sharon says we might look at other consortia for examples. A Tech Prep consortium for 4 colleges and 60 high schools that Ed was involved with did this. All agree to move forward with this process.

Agenda Item II - New Data Allocation: Steve notes there is not a lot of information out there yet, other than it is coming out. There were data points listed in the May 15 AEBG webinar, per Diane. We don't know yet what we will be assessed on for 14-15. Bob asks if it's similar to Perkins E-1 and E-2, and Steve says it is in some areas. There will be metrics that all members will be required to go through. Ed says that the colleges use TOP codes with crosswalk to CIP, but still need to tie into SSN. There are lots of things to be done before it ties into the statewide system. One might be a common student identifier, aligned with WIOA per Sally. Les says the common assessment initiative will require tying into a statewide system, as well. All of the members should be using WIOA identifiers. Each member's internal identifier is not something that moves on. Diane notes that a presenter at last year's Academic Senate CTE Institute indicated CalPASS Plus would be the system. Should we begin collecting SSN again (stopped due to liability issues)? Ed says they are collected currently by AVC, but are blanked out or blind. South Valley Worksource got info that EDD will not be releasing info to them, which would create difficulties for existing programs per Ann. Ed wonders about having the students go through the common CCC application, which would assign a number for them which could be tracked through all three systems. Unless they voluntarily reply to a survey later, it's nigh to impossible to get five-year follow-up info. The state allocation is to go toward addressing that issue ($240,000).

Agenda Item III - Development of Award Letter Template: Steve feels the sub-committee could come up with that, so the submitter could come back later with any questions. It would also be authority for the consortium to create the budget accounts, etc., per Ed.

Agenda Item I - Review of Submitted Proposals: Steve notes we are tabling the review of the proposals until the form is revised and the sub-committee review process is completed.

Sharon notes that Keina called on the CCC Confer line, and it was crystal clear. Hopefully it will be the same in the future.

Steve asks for a date to have the sub-committee meet. Diane and Sally for AVAS, Harold and Bob for SKUSD and Ed and Sharon (Ann will assist her) for AVC will be on that sub-committee. Better for the sub-committee to meet in person, the week before the regular committee meeting. The group agrees to June 6 from 8-11am at AVC for the first meeting.

Next consortium meeting date: June 16, from 10am-noon at AVC. Steve will not be able to attend, nor is Harold so Debi will need to take his place.

Meeting adjourns at 11:00am