Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium
College Resource Leadership Council Business Meeting

Approved Minutes: November 21, 2019

Sheraton Cerritos, 12725 Center Court Dr. S, Cerritos, California 90703

8:30 a.m.-9:45 a.m.

Voting Members present:

- Nick Real, Cerritos Community College
- Michael Wangler, Citrus College
- Nancy Jones, Coastline Community College
- Paul Flor, Compton College
- Kathleen Reiland, Cypress College
- Kendra Madrid, East Los Angeles College
- Virginia Rapp, El Camino College
- Ken Starkman, Fullerton College
- Jan Swinton, Glendale Community College
- Christopher Whiteside, Golden West College
- Debbie Vanschoelandt, Irvine Valley College
- Gene Carbonaro, Long Beach City College
- Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College
- Armando Rivera-Figueroa, Los Angeles City College
- Priscilla Lopez, Los Angeles Harbor College

- Mon Khat, Los Angeles Pierce College
- Lisa Lewenberg (Alternate), Los Angeles Southwest College
- Marcia Wilson, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
- Doug Marriott (Alternate), Los Angeles Valley College
- Jennifer Galbraith, Mt. San Antonio College
- Lisa Knuppel, Orange Coast College
- Julie Kiotas (Alternate), Pasadena City College
- Mike Slavich, Rio Hondo College
- Anthony Teng, Saddleback College
- Kimberly Mathews (Alternate), Santa Ana College
- Patricia Ramos, Santa Monica College
- Elizabeth Arteaga, Santiago Canyon College
- Carmen Dones, West L.A. College

I. **Meeting called to order at 8:37 a.m. by Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC**

II. **Roll Call by Lupe Aramburo, LAOCRC Administrative Secretary**

III. **Minutes from the October 15, 2019 CRLC Business Meeting were Approved**

    a. **Motion:** Kathleen Reiland, Cypress College; **Second**: Jan Swinton, Glendale Community College; **Approved**

IV. **Added Item**

    a. Dr. Marcia Wilson indicated that there was a member who wanted to add commentary about the room layout.

      i. Jennifer Galbraith stated that the room arrangement is an issue. Does not think it is conducive to have a good dialogue. In addition, voting members cannot sit with people within their college for discussion with people they are representing.

      ii. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro responded with the idea being to hear more of the Governance Council Meeting and have a business meeting setup. In the future, the LAOCRC is looking to invite CEO's, CIO's, and vice presidents; therefore, having a business layout felt like a better way to setup and prepare to show how we conduct our business meetings.

      iii. Jennifer Galbraith asked if they are going to change how they have been doing business so that the CEO's, CIO's, and vice presidents can see how they conduct business. Is the shape changing how they conduct business?

      iv. Priscilla Lopez added that if they wanted to bring faculty with them, they are sitting in the back and cannot get feedback.

      v. Dr. Julie Kiotas asked if a vote can be made.

vi.   Dr. Marcia Wilson added that a vote should be viable considering the business meeting being for the voting members, and the DRA should be able to decide on how it is conducted.

vii.   Anthony Teng asked that if CEO's and CIO's will be joining in the future, will the voting members sit in the back.

viii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson mentioned that her concern is that it does not feel welcoming.

ix.   Marla Uliana shared her opinion in that although it may not be popular, she is not opposed with the layout for the business meeting when voting on the programs; however, for the collaborative meeting, the setup is not going to work because it is not collaborative.

x.   Dr. Marcia Wilson is concerned that the collaborative meeting will follow immediately from the business meeting, and the U-shaped layout will be the setup.

xi.   Dr. Gustavo Chamorro responded by mentioning that there is hope in making arrangements in January, to possibly go into another room for the collaborative meeting with the round table layout. Depending on the lunch arrangements that can be made, then the adjustments will take place in January.

xii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson stated that there will be an extra charge, if going into another room.

xiii.   Jennifer Galbraith is concerned that there are no funds for lunch, but there might be funds for an additional room.

xiv.   Dr. Karen Childers added that there will be a conversation during the sub-regional meeting, to talk about next steps regarding lunch and the sub-regional meeting arrangements, for meetings taking place next year.

xv.   Marla Uliana asked that if they have been conducting the meetings at the Sheraton the same way, why it is changing now.

xvi.   Dr. Marcia Wilson states that the LAOCRC is looking to cut cost and the sub-regional meetings will not be held at the Sheraton moving forward. She added, that what is being expressed by the voting members is that the value of the meeting is not only for business decisions, but it is also an opportunity to collaborate and work with other colleges; furthermore, the configuration of the setup does not lead to what the meetings are meant to accomplish. She goes on by suggesting to vote that the layout goes back to its old configuration, and mentions that a motion can be moved and presented to the leadership.

xvii.   Bruce Noble suggested that former college president Mr. Frank provide his take.

xviii.   Larry Frank provided validity in the point made about the collaborative meeting requiring a round table setup, where everyone can collaborate.

xix.   Marla Uliana added that she believes a president, CIO, or a chancellor would appreciate sitting in a collaborative manner – added that the visual makes a difference.

xx.   Dr. Marcia Wilson asked Marla to clarify if she was indeed okay with the business meeting setup or if she preferred the old layout, considering her earlier comments about not being opposed to the U-shaped layout for the business meetings.

xxi.   Marla Uliana clarified that she is not opposed to the business meeting setup; however, she believes that CEO, CIO, and chancellors would appreciate a more collaborative layout.

xxii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson asked if anyone thought that they were not business like or took care of business with the round table setup.

xxiii.   **Jennifer Galbraith *moved a motion*** to recommend that they go back to the original round up sitting.
   a.   **First:** Lisa Knuppel
   b.   **Second:** Kendra Madrid
   c.   **Abstentions:** Marla Uliana, Elizabeth Arteaga, Debbie Vanschoelandt, Virginia Rapp, Dr. Patricia Ramos, Kathleen Reiland, & Lynell Wiggins.

xxiv.   Shari Herzfeld asked if the consortium has thought of holding the meetings at another location, considering the cost. She added that this might be an opportunity to look for a more centered location for everyone.

xxv.   Kendra Madrid suggested to hold the meetings at a college.

xxvi.   Dr. Marcia Wilson mentioned that the LAOCRC decided to hold the meetings at the Sheraton, but the topic can be discussed further and share some ideas as it is on the sub-regional agenda.

I.   **Informational Items**   *Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC*

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

LAOC|RC
los angeles | orange county | regional consortium

3

www.laocrc.org
714.564.5574
laocrc@rsccd.edu

a. **Program Data Requests**

Program Title	Top Code	College
1. Hospitality Management	1307	Cerritos College
2. Educational Studies: ECE Unit Concentration	0802.00 or 1305.10	Coastline College
3. Teach Your Career/Community College Teaching Certificate	899	Coastline College
4. Educational Studies: STEM: Instructional Technology Support Concentration	860	Coastline College
5. Advanced Transportation	948.4	East Los Angeles College
6. Automotive Technology	948	East Los Angeles College
7. Real Estate Finance	511.1	El Camino College
8. Real Estate Investments	511	El Camino College
9. Real Estate Mortgage Loan Brokering and Lending	511	El Camino College
10. Property, Real Estate, and Community Association Managers	511	El Camino College
11. Real Estate Sales Agent	511	El Camino College
12. Real Estate Appraisal	511	El Camino College
13. Real Estate Broker	511	El Camino College
14. Real Estate Assistant	511	El Camino College
15. Real Estate Escrow Officer	511.1	El Camino College
16. Biotechnology Research and Development Lab Technician	430	Fullerton College
17. Cosmetology Crossover to Barbering Certificate	3007	Fullerton College
18. Flexography Skills Certificate	936	Fullerton College
19. Ornamental Horticulture Certificate	109	Fullerton College
20. Facilities Management Program	N/A	Fullerton College
21. Careers in Education	802	Golden West College
22. Show Business - Commercials, Voice-Overs, Film Acting	599	Long Beach City College
23. Teacher Education	802	Long Beach City College
24. Fashion Buying and Merchandising	1303.2	Long Beach City College
25. Fashion Product Development	1303.3	Long Beach City College
26. Custom Apparel Design	1303	Long Beach City College
27. Technical Design	1303.3	Long Beach City College
28. STEAM Education	802	Long Beach City College
29. Fixed Prosthodontics	1240.3	Los Angeles City College
30. Removable Prosthodontics	1240.3	Los Angeles City College
31. Architectural Interior Design History	1302	Los Angeles Mission College
32. Sustainable Design	1302	Los Angeles Mission College
33. Social Media Certificate	N/A	Los Angeles Pierce College
34. Emergency Telecommunication Program	2199	Mt. San Antonio College
35. Radiologic Technology	1225.00	Mt. San Antonio College
36. Homeland Security Planning and Administration	2199	Rio Hondo College
37. Automation Fundamentals Certificate- Pathway to Multiple Disciplines	0934.00, 0934.20, 0934.40, 0935.00, 0945.00, 0946.00, 0946.10, 0952.20, 0956.00, 0958.00	Santiago Canyon College

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

LAOC|RC
los angeles | orange county | regional consortium

4

www.laocrc.org
714.564.5574
laocrc@rsccd.edu

38. Quality Control Food Technician	113	West Los Angeles College
39. Film Production	612.2	West Los Angeles College

b. **Other**

1. **Industrial Automation TOP Code change**   *Tony Teng, Dean, Advanced Technology and Applied Science- Saddleback*

   i. Tony Teng informed the group that this program changed top codes. It was originally placed as a top code under manufacturing; it is now being top coded under electronics, considering it is the strength in the interest of the faculty at Saddleback College. This is the same program that was presented a couple months ago.

2. **Regional Automation Certificate**   *Larry McLaughlin, Regional Director, Energy, Construction, & Utilities*

   i. Elizabeth Arteaga informed that Santiago Canyon College is working with 6 community colleges along with Larry McLaughlin and Terry Schmidt. They had an advisory board meeting a couple weeks ago, where they convened different industries from the different companies, and there was a huge concern regarding students not being trained. There is a need for the community colleges, but some of the challenges are the LMI and getting all the data. The region is thinking of creating two certifications:

      a. 1. Automation Fundamentals (12 Units)
      b. 2. Building Automation Systems

   ii. Larry McLaughlin continued by stating that this project is considered multi-sector and a very important one for the sector, to establish specific skills and training in automation, and to make that transcript available around the state. It is focused on skillset within existing programs that relate to automation. They believe that workers need to have these skills to be competitive within the occupations that they are going to be hired into. The Fundamentals Program is 12 units, and the Building Automation program they are working to develop, will be a small certificate and will stack within existing ring programs with colleges that are participating. These programs are not stand alone, they are not designed to prepare students for employment by themselves, and they assume that other construction will be wrapped around these certifications to qualify students. What students will get, is the essential skillset; however, there are challenges around labor market data trying to analyze this in the usual fashion. With these certifications, students are not prepared to go into employment, the need is the essential skillset. He mentioned that they will add what is created by COE, and hope that they will keep in mind that automation is eliminating a lot of jobs out there. At the same time, the automation industry is creating jobs, because they come with an expectation of higher set of skills. This is a challenge for the region and other regions, as well as programs focused in technical education.

   iii. Terry Schmidt added that there was an industry survey done to find out what the core curriculum and campus need for all the principles are. Of the 6 colleges they are working with, there are 9 different disciplines that are involved, and they found out that these all have a common set of courses or instruction. The colleges that are participating have already developed their own local certificate or in the process of finalizing their programs. This regional certificate is an umbrella for students to create a pathway and be able to pursue their automation careers. After taking the fundamentals, students can then transfer into any of the 6 participating colleges and pursue their career in any of those areas.

   iv. Dr. Marcia Wilson mentioned that the question that came up last month was, if this is a program that will be available in Orange County, or if it will be available for the Los Angeles colleges as well. She believes that the answer was that it depended on the LMI, and asked if that is still the status?

   v. Larry McLaughlin responded by stating that they have to look carefully at what the demand is for occupations that have these particular skills, and that is what will determine whether the project will work and spread out. They have 6 colleges in Orange County working on this Strong Workforce project, and moving forward, they want to collaborate and expand. They have to look at what the

demand and supply is, and keep in mind that it is something that a lot of programs are going to be using for future jobs.

3. **Chancellor's Office memo #AA 19-44**   *Karen Childers, LA Director, LAOCRC*

   Collaborative Programs Eligibility Criteria

   and Submission Guidelines,

   dated October 22, 2019

   i.   Dr. Karen Childers started by mentioning that this memo is regarding collaborative programs, and it was shared to see if it is top of mind for the group or if it is in progress. She asked how it is informing, and what additional information is needed for the region?

   ii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson clarified that it is the memo around collaborative local degrees and associate degrees of transfer. She continued with explaining that there were some discussions in the earlier meetings on when there is a collaborative degree, followed by questions around who gets the completions in terms of funding formula, and how enrollment and student success outcomes are shared.

   iii.   Dr. Karen Childers responded that she is uncertain if there are any in the region.

   iv.   Dr. Armando Rivera-Figueroa added that he believes they may have some, and asked if one course is enough to call it a collaborative program?

   v.   Dr. Karen Childers informed the group that she will be taking the questions forward to the chancellor's office.

   vi.   Jennifer Galbraith stated that Mt. SAC has a collaborative program and currently works with Citrus College.

   vii.   Bruce Noble mentioned that Rio Hondo College built the collaborative for HEAC across Los Angeles region. It started with 6 colleges, with the key component being common outcomes that can market to employers as a value proposition. Then they cross walked the curriculum and shared the elements within the assessment. The assessment was covered in the courses, so the courses were not lacking and had the content and outcomes in the curriculum. On a school by school basis with the third party certificate, there are credits regarding this articulation basis, and those students as they transfer, will work on a capstone with hopes that faculty will accept those certificates as requirement.

   viii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson stated that it is how it was done before, when they had this guidance because that is collaborative; however, it is just curriculum alignment and articulation across the community colleges. It is a certificate that is designed to be a partnership where students take these courses at certain colleges. In Advanced Transportation, they have been partnering with Los Angeles Valley College looking at some non-credit certifications where students take some courses at Los Angeles Trade-Tech College and some courses at Los Angeles Valley College, around some of the transit careers and yet they did not have a model.

   ix.   Jennifer Galbraith mentioned that by looking at the collaborative CTE certificates, the memo on page 2, number 3 says, "Courses must be available in distance education modality." She asked if that means that all have to have the distance modality. It is possibly an issue. Why is it a must?

   x.   Kimberly Mathews stated that Page 2 number 5 under Eligibility Criteria, it says "Each college catalog must list the courses offered in the program and where courses may be taken that are not offered at the home college." She went on by expressing her concern that to her knowledge for biotech in Orange County, they are not currently doing that, and asked if it is the new programs or do they have to already have a collaborative program? She clarified that the course is currently listed on the catalog; however, they do not list the other colleges where students can take the course.

   xi.   Dr. Marcia Wilson asked if all the courses available at Santa Ana College?

   xii.   Kimberly Mathews responded by saying yes.

   xiii.   Dr. Marcia Wilson then added that it is different when there is a certificate where all of the courses are available at a college and there are certain courses at another college, so students can just go from one college to another and not be articulated. Her interpretation of item number 5 on the

memo is that the intent is that there are some courses that one college will offer, but the sister college would not offer the same courses. That is what this guidance is for.

xiv. Denise Snider mentioned that the biotech courses work that way. They are not listed in the catalog but they are on all the marketing.

xv. Dr. Karen Childers reiterated that all the questions will be taken to the chancellor's office.

xvi. Tony Teng added that this may not be popular but seems to be that this memo is directed to the local colleges. Is intending for this region to open up so that they can come in and work with these local colleges, but doesn't give an opportunity to work with each other and have similar opportunities.

xvii. Bruce Noble mentioned that the issue is on the curriculum side, so that there is a collaborative program but not a regional collaboration that is approved by the curriculum committee and stackable toward another colleges credential; then, it can be done because each credential program is approved locally by the curriculum committee. The issue is if there is a great idea and there is no program, but there is another, how can a program with shared resources be put together when the colleges are nearby. It will be impossible because there is local curriculum control, so when trying to get the program approved, it only gets approved locally, and the local curriculum committee is not going to approve a curriculum at another college. It has to be all in-house, and aside from being un-virtual, how could one do a collaboration not between courses, but between curriculum committees, and how can that work?

xviii. Lynell Wiggins mentioned that he is curious to know what the questions around funding for collaborative programs are, and wondered if there is any new guidance around that in relation to this topic? He also mentioned that he has heard that if there is a collaborative program and the student starts at a specific institution first, then that college gets the completion on the back end. Also added that there has not been guidance on that.

xix. Dr. Marcia Wilson responded that she too has that question and there does not seem to be clarity or guidance to that.

xx. Dr. Gustavo Chamorro responded by mentioning that there was a discussion during one of the regional consortium calls around that, and both Dr. Childers and himself will be at the chancellor's office in a couple weeks and will bring up the questions, in hopes of getting some answers.

xxi. Marla Uliana added that she thought that programs had to be listed on the catalogs. She can see it is working with curriculum committees, both colleges will be putting forward their program and then putting it together in a collaborative program. The committee will then be voting on their classes, but the program will be introduced to both curriculum committees because both will have to approve the program and just list it in the catalog with the locations.

xxii. Lisa Knuppel asked who poses the program.

xxiii. Marla Uliana answered that it is what is in question.

xxiv. Dr. Marcia Wilson added that it is still the question that is unanswered. It is important especially because when it comes to being funded by enrollment only, one colleges will get funds by your enrollment and courses and the other college will get the enrollment; however, now that there are funds available for completions, those questions do matter. Karen and Gustavo will bring this forward to chancellor's office.

xxv. Kendra Madrid asked, how does this affect student's financial aid?

II. **Action Items**
Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC

a. **Program Recommendation; Motion to approve 1-7:** Marla Uliana, Los Angeles Mission College; Second: Carmen Dones, West Los Angeles College; **APPROVED**

1. **Automotive Technology: Hybrid. Electric and Alternative Fuels**, El Camino College

2. **Electrical Engineering Technicians**, East LA College
3. **Computer Numerical Control (CNC) Machine Tool Operator**, Pasadena City College
4. **Machine Shop Technology**, Pasadena City College
5. **After School Program Associate Teacher**, Santa Ana College
6. **After School Program Assistant**, Santa Ana College
7. **Secondary Education (Pre-Professional)**, Santa Ana Colle

b. **Lifespan of LMI and LA/OC COE LMI requirement**   *Jacob Poore, Research Analyst, COE, Orange County, LAOCRC*

   Juan Madrigal, Assistant Director COE, Los Angeles, LAOCRC

i. Juan Madrigal reviewed the program recommendation report process and the changes that have been implemented in the reports. The way it is presented has changed, it still provides traditional LMI data, employer jobs, demand and supply. The summary analysis has changed, COE now looks at the community colleges and occupational demand, wages, job postings, educational attainment, and want to focus on occupations that are middle scale. Non-community college data is now included as well.

ii. Kathleen Reiland asked if there is a new program that has more of a national job placement, how will it be reflected in the report as far as recommendation goes?

iii. Juan Madrigal responded that those are conversations to have with faculty or voting members and COE will incorporate that information, as it does not fall under the traditional process.

iv. Denise Snider mentioned that when Larry McLaughlin was talking about the automation pathway and a colleges to be a hosts to DSNs, there was a discussion on how they may have other sources to Regional Directors with industry information that does not show in COE searches. She followed that comment by asking how the data found can be incorporated into COE reports so that they do not have multiple reports that are being produced.

v. Juan Madrigal stated that COE encourages everyone to send their data to incorporate those sources into COE reports. COE is trying to be more inclusive because there are some limitations in the data.

vi. Denise Snider asked if that something that COE will reach out to them on, or if requestors are to bring it to COE?

vii. Jacob Poore responded that when filling out the program data request, there is a portion where additional information, data, or documents can be provided. COE can review that information and incorporate it or validate it.

viii. Juan Madrigal added that chances are that while submitting a request, one will know whether the data will support or not. It is the best opportunity to submit all information when submitting a request.

ix. Shari Herzfeld proposed that COE automatically contact the Regional Director at the appropriate sector if there is one. She stated that various times, the numerical data and quantitative data do not match. Regional Directors may have knowledge of programs that are too small to issue certificates, or have SOC codes or top codes that are not inclusive of the application. She suggested that as a standard, Regional Directors should be notified.

x. Jennifer Galbraith mentioned that she thought it was part of what faculty does, when working with the Regional Directors, they should be the ones that are doing that with the creative programs. It should not necessarily be the COE who needs to reach out.

xi. Shari Herzfeld responded that it is not required and sometimes faculty does not want to hear what Regional Directors have to say. Sometimes they are trying to build certificates to generate completions. At some point in the process, it should be a mandatory stop.

xii. Juan Madrigal responded that it is a process that the entire state follows. COE cannot enforce

that; it is not feasible. The colleges can try to do that.

xiii. Jennifer Galbraith also stated that wage data is not current; requestors need to be contacted because the reports go out with old information.

xiv. Juan Madrigal responded that COE will collaborate and include that information.

xv. Jennifer Galbraith stated that currently reports within the last two years are accessible, and asked if the language be referencing the endorsement on those reports?

xvi. Juan Madrigal stated that currently data from the last 24 months can be used, but he would like to propose that it changes to 12 months. The templates have changed and COE is using reports that are from last June, and they are different. He added that it would be useful to come to a consensus that reports from the last 12 months be used. At the same time when submitting a request, data will be updated depending on where it falls because college presidents would like to see that information. The reports will be updated only when submitting a request, they will not be updated without a request.

xvii. Marla Uliana mentioned that the challenge with proposing data from the last 12 months is that they can currently pull data from the last 24 months, and that means they have to request data again.

xviii. Jennifer Galbraith suggested that data from the last 24 months is grandfathered, and moving forward it changes to 12 months.

xix. Marla Uliana asked that when it comes to process, she thought that when LMI program data request information came in, COE would send notifications to voting members.

xx. Juan Madrigal responded that when he created the automated system, it was not sending the notifications, and he just realized it. He will be sending the confirmation emails manually to both the requestor and the voting member moving forward.

xxi. Jacob Poore reviewed the marketing and distributions report for the contemporary marketing program. Most components are the same, they provided traditional LMI. However, considering that marketing is a unique skill, in the sense that it can be used in a variety of occupations, and there is a defined trajectory of job titles that go through in marketing. COE looked more into the job postings to look at the skills that were in common to try to inform the program more to provide the option of helping students focus on specific skills more because they are common throughout a variety of job titles. Moreover, Marketing has traditional occupations that COE can rely on to show some data, but also incorporate what employers are asking for. Most of the components are all still there, endorsement language, traditional LMI, and they focus the report on middle scale jobs, meaning that the educational requirements are aligned with what community colleges are able to provide. He added that it might depend on the program, but also on the information that is provided when submitting requests. Also, when a confirmation email is sent, and it is an opportunity for the requestor to provide additional information if available. It will be helpful to have as much information sent ahead of time, to make sure that both the requestor and COE are on the same page early in the process, in order to have a more rapid turnaround.

xxii. Juan Madrigal reiterated that it is important to review the report and advice COE immediately if there are any questions, comments, or concerns. He added that many times COE receives calls or emails from faculty or deans providing data reports that are not COE reports, and asking if they can be used; however, the only reports that are acceptable to be used, are LA/OC reports coming from COE.

xxiii. Dr. Julie Kiotas disagreed considering that Pasadena City College has a research team. She provided an example about the fact that 30% of artists are paid under the table and it is very difficult to collect that data using traditional methodology, and the art center keeps that data.

xxiv. Juan Madrigal responded that it is not the only source; however, COE is the mandatory source that can be used when submitting program applications.

xxv. Dr. Marcia Wilson added that it is not something that the region has control over. The state has mandated that COE data be used. If in case COE data does not align, it is allowable to attach additional data that can be used to create COE reports.

xxvi.	Jennifer Galbraith commented on the previous conversation regarding the timeframe to pull data from. She mentioned that the curriculum process has a rapid turnaround and although she is okay moving forward with 12 months prior, she would like to recommend that 24 months are grandfathered for those that are already in the system. She also added that they use LA/OC region COE data only.
xxvii.	Lisa Knuppel responded that 24 months' data will be too old. She also mentioned that the use of the COE report is important for the record, to confirm that COE LMI is the only one that can be used. She also requested that Inland Empire information be included in the employment data that incorporates national statewide information.
xxviii.	Juan Madrigal stated that in the past Inland Empire data has been used as an addendum in LA/OC; however, COE needs to do their due diligence in making sure that supply from the region is included. If the requestor knows that they would like certain information on their report, COE can provide the supply.
xxix.	Lisa Knuppel added that the argument is that COE incorporates what is known about where labor market is growing and where students are being employed; because, many students are training in the LA/OC areas, but the occupation opportunities are somewhere else.
xxx.	Katie Mishler mentioned that she is working with Ruth Amanuel on a supplementary group course for their sectors and have kept COE in the loop from the very beginning, and asked if it would qualify to be acceptable from COE?
xxxi.	Juan Madrigal responded with confirming that it would be an addendum to something that COE would produce, but yes.
xxxii.	Dr. Marcia Wilson reiterated that the region can only submit reports by LA/OC COE's. She also confirmed that moving forward, the shelf life of the reports is that of 12 months; however, the data that has been requested within the last 24 months will be grandfathered.
xxxiii.	Marla Uliana asked if it means that they still have 24 months, but have to pull new data if going over 12 months.
xxxiv.	Dr. Marcia Wilson responded no, and added that as a region they determined that the point of notice is pulling the data, so when pulling the data, it only lasts 12 months, and so new data will have to be pulled if the program was not completed in the 12 months.
xxxv.	Marla Uliana asked if the program is not completed within the 12 months, if a new program data request needs to be submitted.
xxxvi.	Dr. Marcia Wilson confirmed that yes, a new program data request will have to be requested once again.

1. **Motion:** Kendra Madrid, East Los Angeles College; **Second:** Lisa Knuppel, Orange Coast College**; APPROVED**
2. **Abstentions:** Julie Kiotas, Pasadena City College; Bruce Noble, Rio Hondo College; Nick Real, Cerritos College

III. **Updates**   *Dr. Marcia Wilson, CRLC Chair and Dean*
                                                            Resource Associate Chair, LAOCRC

a. Districts
   i. Cerritos
   ii. Citrus:
      - As of November 20th, 2019, Michael Wangler has been appointed as permanent Career Education Dean at Citrus College.
   iii. Coastline
   iv. Compton
   v. Cypress
   vi. East Los Angeles
   vii. El Camino

POWERED BY
California Community Colleges

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

LAOC|RC
los angeles | orange county | regional consortium

1

www.laocrc.org
714.564.5574
laocrc@rsccd.edu

    viii.   Fullerton

    ix.   Glendale

    x.   Golden West

    xi.   Irvine Valley

    xii.   Long Beach

    xiii.   Los Angeles City:

- Daniel Wanner is the new Associate Dean of Curriculum and Pathways at Los Angeles City College, who will also be the Alternate Voting Member.

    xiv.   Los Angeles Harbor:

- The acting lead of Education Workforce Development (EWD), Erica Mayorga has left to ELAC for a permanent position, and Los Angeles Harbor College is currently in transition; there is currently an acting Dean of Student Services in EWD, and Priscilla Lopez is helping assisting as well. In addition, there is also a new Alternate Voting Member, Associate Dean, STEM Pathways, Nelly Rodriguez.

    xv.   Los Angeles Mission:

- New Alternate Voting Member and Assistant Dean, Fabiola Mora who came from Los Angeles City College. In addition, they will be running 3 construction readiness programs in the spring of 2020.

    xvi.   Los Angeles Pierce

    xvii.   Los Angeles Southwest

    xviii.   Los Angeles Trade-Technical

    xix.   Los Angeles Valley

    xx.   Mt. SAC

    xxi.   Orange Coast

    xxii.   Pasadena City:

- Reminder that Pasadena City College will be hosting Skills USA on January 25th, 2019.

    xxiii.   Rio Hondo: Margaret:

- Rio Hondo has updated NOVA, if anyone is interested in seeing where they are with the 9 projects they are running. Also, regarding Net Lab, they created an RFT with the business department for the employer engagement piece; it has been posted and they have gotten some companies that are helping. The 13 colleges that are involved can keep an eye out for that.

    xxiv.   Saddleback:

- Expressed appreciation to the Advanced Transportation Regional Coordinators from Los Angeles and Orange County who supported the California Automotive Teachers Conference that was hosted in October. They had over 250 instructors and industry advisors present at Saddleback to the 2-day conference. If it was not for the Regional Coordinators, it would not have been a success as it was.

    xxv.   Santa Ana

    xxvi.   Santa Monica

    xxvii.   Santiago Canyon:

- A new permanent Strong Workforce Director was hired and will be starting on December 2nd, 2019.

    xxviii.   West Los Angeles

  b. **Other**

IV.   **Adjourn**

The next CRLC Meeting will be a <u>Conference Call</u> on **December 12, 2019** from 8:30 A.M. - 9:45 A.M.