

EC MEMBERS PRESENT*: Joanne Armstrong, NOCE; Ranae Bryant, AUHSD; **Joyce Carrigan, NOCCCD; Kenia Cueto, NOCROP; April Guajardo, NOCE; Raine Hambly, NOCE; Kenneth Lopour, LAUSD; Valentina Purtell, NOCCCD; Connie Van Luit, GGUSD; Steve Zamora, FJUHSD**

EC MEMBERS ABSENT*: Margie Abab, NOCE; Santanu Bandyopadhyay, CC; **Carrie Bisgard, PYLUSD; Araceli Chavez, AUHSD; Jei Garlitos, AUHSD; Katalin Gyurindak, NOCE; Gail Kairis, NOCROP; Sandi Layana, FJUHSD; Anna Lopez, FJUHSD; Dana Lynch, NOCROP; José Ramón Núñez, FC; Heidi Olshan, LAUSD; Katy Ramezani, OCDE; Linda Skipper, NOCROP; Julie Ornelas-Smith, AUHSD**

*Bold text denotes Board-Approved Designees and/or Alternatives who officially voted

ADDITIONAL WG MEMBERS PRESENT: Adam Gottdank, NOCE/DSS WG

NOCRC STAFF PRESENT: Jesse Crete (Project Lead), Katherine Pham (Project Lead), Kerrie Cornell (ESL, Basic Skills, DSS), Ivan Stanojkovic (ESL, Basic Skills, DSS), Renee Day (SASS), Joelle Haptonstall (DSS), Hilda Rivera (ESL).

GUESTS PRESENT INVITED BY NOCRC: N/A

I. Welcome

II. Approve February 15th, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Amendment to Meeting Minutes:

- i. Correction: Connie Van Luit – Under section 6, “Member Updates”
 1. Working with Burlington English and Rancho Santiago on New World of Work badges
- ii. Correction: Ivan Stanojkovic – Page 3, “Strategy updates”
 1. Julie Volunteered DSS not Basic Skills
- b. MOTION to approve the meeting minutes as they have been amended
 - i. Steve Zemora motions to approve
 - ii. Connie Van Luit, seconds
 - iii. VOTE PASSED

I. ESL Strategy Presentation

- a. Ivan shared a PowerPoint Presentation
- b. Offsite Locations offering ESL Classes
 - i. Anaheim Campus
 - i. Fullerton College
 - ii. Garden Grove, One-Stop
 - iii. Local K-12s
- a. Beginning Numbers
 - i. There were approximately 50 offsite locations when this strategy first started, but now there are about 29

- b. 3 specific strategies work with the locations mentioned
 - i. Babysitting, Counseling, Mentorship
- c. ESL has decided not to initiate any new strategies, so the focus will be on the existing
- d. Identifying the needs of ESL students
 - i. Lack of babysitting – provided starting 3 years ago
 - ii. Class average of 20 students, with 5 to 6 students utilizing the babysitting
- e. Budget over the years
 - i. Year to year, from 540K to 240K
 - ii. This Year: 75K
 - iii. Projection for the upcoming year may be lower to focus on sites that will be utilizing/needing babysitting services vs. assume and budget for entire region
- f. Mentorship
 - i. Before the mentorship program there was an issue with students transitioning from NOCE ESL to Fullerton College (credit side). Students would transfer, however, some didn't stay long due to a variety of reasons
 - 1. Structure of classes may have been a confusing factor which made transition a bit more difficult
 - 2. Mentorship Program was created to help the transition of students now lead by Hilda Rivera, Special Projects Coordinator
 - ii. Currently there are 2 mentors working alongside Hilda, supporting 19 mentees
 - iii. Not many students were ready to transition right away when the program first started
 - iv. This year, based on Hilda Rivera's outreach there has been over 130 students interested in transitioning to Fullerton College, 15 transitions ready
 - 1. Target Outcome: Transition to post-secondary
 - 2. Goal is to expand service to Cypress College along with Fullerton College
- g. Offsite Counseling
 - i. Students who are going to ESL classes were unaware of additional services NOCE offers
 - ii. Counselors are leading orientations and workshops, having one-on-one sessions, and providing tours for students at offsite classes to engage and show them the resources that are available
 - 1. Targeted Outcome: Transition
 - 2. Students have shown successful transitions to programs like CTE and have demonstrated interest in credit classes
 - iii. Challenges
 - 1. Appropriate space for one-on-one meetings with students at the K-12 sites
 - 2. Most ESL classes are in the morning, when space isn't available
 - 3. Staff changes with counseling to experiment scheduling
 - iv. Current Situation
 - 1. Two counselors with steady schedules that can adjust to the needs of the students at offsite locations
 - v. Alignment strategy will initiate this year
 - 1. Will help NOCE ESL students transition to Fullerton College ESL

2. Set-up of an alignment process so that students do not necessarily have to take an assessment to figure out which ESL class they belong in, but instead a clear path is provided for them to see where they can start
 3. Report back has shown students feeling intimidated which correlates to not testing well
 - a) Instructors believe students end up in lower classes than they should have been placed due to fear of assessment
 4. Still in progress: Faculty at both institutions are going to have students take a placement test and analyze writing samples to see where students should be placed
 - a) Alignment won't be set-up too high to the point where students are unable to pass; or too low where it wouldn't make sense to use the alignment
- vi. Distance Learning
1. There are no online ESL classes offered by NOCE which lead to a build out of strategy currently being built by faculty
 2. Curriculum has only been developed this year, so the strategy has yet to be implemented. Currently awaiting state approval
 3. Discussion
 - a) Jesse asked if this was done with Burlington English?
 - (i) it is stand alone, but can be done with Burlington English later if that is the direction the faculty chooses to go in. However, it was designed to be a standalone class
 - (ii) The type/kind of class is Advanced
 - b) Raine - At this time NOCE can't offer online courses because there is no way to collect data but would like to connect to see how ESL is setting it up. For an online course to be set-up, it would have to be done through Canvas which CTE is the only department currently using Canvas
 - c) Ivan - It was built out of Canvas, so that is covered. One of the thoughts was that WASC came in and one of the areas that they wanted to see development was in online classes. Hence, Canvas was wanted to be used as a tool. Therefore, we using Canvas now is in preparation
 - d) Valentina - This might be something that will hopefully help streamline everyone's efforts at NOCE with at least in Distance Education. There will be a workgroup that will be led by the Academic Senate that will look at building a structure for online education for NOCE. The dates and plans will be shared with everyone once Valentia has more details
 - e) Hope to be approved by the state soon, then conversation can begin as to when the online courses can be offered
- vii. Lower Level Academic Success
1. There is an upper level academic success that already exist, but the ESL department has identified that it is too difficult for students which is why the lower level academic success program was created
 2. Purpose of the program is for students who are interested in going to community colleges, more aligned with how classes are run on the credit side
 3. Courses were completed almost two years ago, but still awaiting on state approval. Hoping to offer the program Fall 2018

- viii. Constructive criticism and feedback are welcome for future presentations on other workgroups, questions/information the Executive Committee would like to know
 - 1. Valentina mentioned that the mentorship strategy is exciting with how it is blossoming as it was originally initiated by Fullerton College's faculty member, the connection being through ESL Fullerton college, but now the plan to expand to Cypress which is great. Somewhere in this strategy development document, Valentina sees an interest in developing a mentorship program for high school students which makes her wonder whether the efforts can be merged or if there are certain lessons in an area that can be applicable in the high school programs
 - 2. It is kind of happening right now because when students approach/meet with Hilda and they are ready for the credited college, the student must meet with a counselor to guide them. Hilda also keeps tracks of the students who are transitioning and then follows up with the students every 3-4 month that are still in the program
 - 3. Basic Skills has discussed this strategy and is looking at it
- ix. Jesse asked if this the type of information the Executive Committee wanted
 - 1. Executive Committee agrees that it was helpful

III. Consortium Updates

- a. Who is an AEBG Student?
- b. Referencing the AEBG Outcome PowerPoint Slide
 - i. Outcomes announcement that was released in August is causing some confusion among the workgroups
 - 1. Report referred to Adult Ed Block Grant students, the outcomes themselves were no longer reporting only on students "touched" by AEBG, so the confusion was if every noncredit student is an AEBG student
 - ii. Discussion amongst NOCRC and feedback for the workgroups
 - 1. Jesse showed recent outcomes from the state that were published on the webinar on Friday, March 9th, 2018. PowerPoint was provided to Executive Committee via email
 - i. **Kerrie wrote** - Per report, AEBG students are adults who attain milestones or outcomes, aligned to WIOA definition of a participant under AEFLAS WIOA Title II with 12 or more instructional contact hours of instructions in ABE, ASE, ESL, or CTE
 - ii. **Katherine wrote** - Jesse's interpretation is by the popular definition, "The number of adults served by the Consortium and who it is, all students/adults who obtain milestones or outcomes, aligns with WIOA, AB104 legislative language, is a participant under these types of things and receiving these types of services is who we are reporting on for outcomes." – in the reporting elements for outcome section. However, the state has not said, "is that every single student, every noncredit student, or adult ed. Student is an AEBG student." Jesse Crete furthers interpretation by saying, she feels that every student can be one and we can serve every student who is Adult Ed., Noncredit at any of the program areas, but we must still follow the guidelines of supplanting which did not leave
- 2. Supplanting
 - i. Workgroups were confused because we were reporting everyone, and assumed supplanting no longer existed

- i. States definition of supplanting is if a program was covered by general funds/other funding sources, it cannot be covered by AEBG
 1. Exception would be if something was originally covered by a general fund and the money no longer became available, which would result in the program being cancelled, then AEBG could step in and help
3. Valentina believes it is important to distinguish who is an AEBG student versus supplanting
 - i. State decided that all Adult Education students and all noncredit students being served by AEBG eligible instructional areas are considered AEBG students which therefore needs to be reported as far as enrollment and outcomes
 - ii. Starting 2018/19 all Adult Ed and noncredit students being served by non-instructional are AEBG eligible students, which include:
 - i. Basic Skills - Adult Education
 - ii. Secondary Education
 - iii. Programs for Students with Disabilities
 - iv. English as Second Language, and Immigrant Education
 - v. There are 2 categories that are unique to developed education because they merge over some guaranteed programs for older adults
 1. Assisting School Age Children with Academic Success
 2. Entry and Re-entry by older adults
 - vi. Any noncredit or Adult Education student who enrolls in any of these instructional areas are considered as AEBG students and must be reported on for outcomes/enrollments. As far as supplanting, AEBG language documentation – if there is a service that is being provided by a planting source other than AEBG, if that funding source is still available for that service, it cannot be removed to use AEBG funds because that would be considered as supplanting
4. Jesse Crete posted state and AEBG definition of supplanting on the projector:
 - i. “What is supplanting? The funds may not free up state or local dollars for other purposes but should create or augment programs to an extent not possible without AEBG funding. You must be able to demonstrate that the funds are added to the amount of state or local funds that would in absence of the grant funds be made available for use to specified in your plan.”
 - ii. This is the AEBG allowable guidelines document that has been shared before, but Jesse Crete will email to committee
5. Connie Van Luit asked what it would mean for high school adults that are 18 and over that are not concurrent? Students who are coming off the street that want a high school diploma, are they considered AEBG students?
 - i. May be a perception of the words and how it is interpreted of the AEBG student.
 - i. Jesse’s understanding is that any of the students that are in any of those programs are eligible to be served using the funds of AEBG and we report on all students. But, for purposes of the workgroup, just because we report on all our Adult Ed./noncredit students does not necessarily mean that every one of those students can be funded because supplanting should still be considered which is what is coming up in the workgroups. Workgroups are using the definition of

“all noncredit students are AEBG students” and therefore that money should go to them and other funding shouldn’t be used which is why this distinction is being presented. All noncredit and Adult Ed. students are being reported on for outcomes, but who is the AEBG student is decided by the workgroups and Executive Committee

6. Valentina would like clarification on the terminology because the state specifically says, “All noncredit and adult ed. students who are enrolled in the areas that are not listed are reported under AEBG...”
 - i. It was suggested to come up with a different term of “AEBG funded students” for clarity. Noncredit/Adult Ed. Students enrolled in the programs will be confused and may just be referred as an “AEBG Student”. So, moving forward, we can call them “reportable students” or “AEBG Funded Students”
7. Connie thinks it would be a bit confusing because the next chart shows “High School Diploma” students (referencing the AEBG outcome PowerPoint hand-out)
8. These are the PowerPoint slides for specific outcomes which show the way we currently have it set-up, which Valentina had a part in creating the chart with the committee
 - i. Outcomes are being pulled from AEBG outcomes, examples: Literacy gains, obtaining a diploma, students gaining employment, post-secondary, etc.
9. Post-secondary is from students transition to Adult or noncredit CTE, and credit bearing programs
10. How does DSS and SASS fit into these categories
 - i. DSS fits with some outcomes like literacy gains, entry/re-entry and transitioning, however there are other areas that don’t
 - ii. None of the outcomes align with SASS strategies
 - i. Data collection is challenging
 - iii. Joanne - SASS is not defined under that population
 - iv. Jesse – First bullet, “Number of adult served by the consortium”, aligned to... reportable definition, but what are more contact hours to instruction?
 - v. Valentina - Will need to look at her documentation for reference
 - vi. Jesse - For SASS there is a lot of question for data collection because it is a unique population
 - vii. Valentina - The reason being is what is reportable as an individual student that participates in activities and strategy services calling under SASS instructional or AEBG but the students can be enrolled in a variety of professional areas that are noncredit and adult education. Which could be parenting, Basic Skills, and other variety of programs. Other agencies choose to offer SASS services under a different umbrella rather than Parenting Program, but it may not our case in other consortiums
11. There are other slides that are specific to DSS and SASS, but Jesse did not have it available at the time of the meeting. Jesse comments that the DSS slides were basically in alignment with Basic Skills, certificate obtainment, or transition employment. Current slide talks about what is under each of the other areas, the full PowerPoint can be accessed in the attachment that was in the Executive Committee e-mail

12. Margie would like clarification on reporting outcomes. If it is done for onsite and off-site high school students? Are they students who are touched by a strategy by AEBG are benefitting from AEBG funds?
 - i. As Valentina distinguished it, for AEBG we must report on all the noncredit students, but workgroups and Executive Committee must decide where to distribute the funds with supplanting in mind
13. From Raine's supplanting experiences with working at the state chancellor's office in other grant work, what helps is to remember to not look at it as whether the money will go away out of general funds, but to look at it as whether the service must be provided to every student being served
 - i. An example may be the counseling services. Counseling services to a certain amount must be provided to students, so students cannot be distinguished that just because a student is an AEBG student, they must go through AEBG services.
 - ii. Another example may be, CTE/Basic Skill students - NOCE still must provide the services that it was initially providing, but if there is something being done outside of the general services for every students, then that's where AEBG may be able to come in to enhance services versus eliminating from the general because it is required through the entity to provide those services to the students
14. Valentina replied to Raine's point, you should not be supplanting, but supplementing
 - i. As an example, with the counselors to provide services to NOCE students. If resources were not enough to provide it to 100% of the student population and all the funding sources were exhausted, we can then use AEBG funds to supplement services
15. Steve does not think that is correct because that would then be considered supplanting because counseling is a service that should be supplied to all students no matter how thin resources are. The conversation or topic may be on additional counselors or additional services that is on top of what students are already receiving
16. The offsite labs may be a good example, as offsite students can come to NOCE to access the counselors there, but AEBG chose to enhance the services by providing counselors who were dedicated to the students to provide more comprehensive services than what takes place at NOCE. So, students could still come to NOCE and NOCE is still in compliance to SSSP, same with ESL students
17. Margie asked for clarification on exceptions for positions at NOCE that comes to an end. If the position ends, then there is no way to service the students. Can AEBG funds then be used to hire those positions?
 - i. Only if it can be demonstrating that it is not a part of the general fund and what is general funding, also that it is to supplement/enhance still which would not be there otherwise
18. Right now, it is a category funded position which will come to an end, but the question is whether AEBG funds can introduce the position as a different category funded position
19. This is where we decide the clarity of definitions since these are the questions that are coming up in the workgroups, which it is important to have the dialogue and that

- everyone is on the same page with strategizing correctly while following the allowable guidelines
20. Steve asked if there has been some discussion or training done with regards to what constitutes to basic general education services provided? This may be of help to differentiate what falls under supplanting and what doesn't. To use Raine's example of counseling, what the general foundational services to be applied. What would be supplanting services here vs. supplementing?
 21. Kenia asked where Orange County ROP fits in with trying to make sense of services provided at the community college that can be utilized by the ROP, or can ROP receive funding through AEBG to continue serving ROP students on ROP premises
 - i. Should be working with Valentina and ROP to come up with what is required as a noncredit institution and part of the district as to what is required.
 - ii. As for ROP, what are you required to serve for the adults?
 22. Steve adds that in the K-12 education, it is called a Core Educational Program. What is outside of that is what can be used for supplemental. The question is what is the core education program that applies through here?
 23. Jesse believes this may be helpful for Executive and workgroups to use as a base to know.
 - i. This also ties in with the Logic Model which is from the state that shows where the benchmarks are, and it shows the starting point to the end of what it is non-negotiable
 - ii. Outcomes and population served, the document may be a good starting point and is another piece of the core educational program to help with how to make sense of everything
 24. May help with an example of CTE/I-BEST program too. The CTE I-BEST program requires to have a teacher teach the class, but Raine cannot just come up with additional funding to provide the classes. As part of the certificate, CTE has to offer enough classes to complete the certificate, but there is not a requirement to have an additional teacher teaching the class to help with student's success. Partnering with AEBG, CTE was able to provide an additional instructor to co-instruct and help students move along with getting their certificate which is how CTE leverages the program.
 25. Margie's direct instructions services may be like Raine's example in the sense that she is required to do the high school diploma labs based on the approved curriculum that she goes through, but funds of AEBG in specific key areas to help the students pass it faster
 26. The difference between the K-12 system and the Core Educational Program is that K-12 districts are required to provide those educational programs to service the community
 27. On the community college side, it is not a requirement to provide adult education, noncredit or credit. However, district chooses to provide the programs, hence the term used is "eligible". District chooses to provide a set of instructional programs, student support services, and certain instructional programs/services that are eligible for general funds, which is somewhat of the distinction
 28. Steve thinks it still works in a similar way because the board still must approve that, and it happens at the K-12 level too. The board must approve that then becomes the Core Educational Program, so it cannot vary from distance to distance because of the

- statewide graduation requirements. Beyond this there is a Core Education Program that the board approves and if this is the case it becomes a standard, and anything beyond that is supplemental.
- i. Deciding on what is supplemental. Questions to think about is the administrative need, how it is monitored. In case questions are asked later and to add additional need is to think of what data shows and how to provide for that need and evaluate effectiveness. If that information can be shown, then there is a justification for the supplemental program
29. Adam says that historically that may be relevant or not relevant. During the recession, the state passed a law that allowed K-12 to reallocate of adult education funds to change the formations. A lot of the adult educational programs either went completely away or got greatly diminished base on that individual specific district decision. Hence, when the grant came back out, Adult Education and Noncredit might now be funding some of the old programs that originally was rid of which brings the point to North Orange Continuing Education. It is going through a fiscal crisis that may be similar although the causes differ. The states healthy financially, but the district enrollment is down which in some ways the decisions are similar with deciding on positions because of resources diminishing, so it seems like there are some similarities with what happened 10 years ago when the state allowed resources to be reallocated and planned differently. Would like to know whether it is relevant?
30. Valentina says it is very relevant, but there still needs to be clarification from the state as to how it applies to the context of community colleges nowadays.
- i. Additionally, to bring everyone into the loop, the department of finance proposes a different funding for a lot of things that contributed to certain situations. One being the newly proposed funding formula for the community colleges. If it was to be implemented tomorrow the way it currently is purposed, the noncredit would go through a 50% cut. As of now it is supposed to be implemented in 2018/19. This will then be brought back to the region, as this point, worst case scenario, if only 50% of the services and programs can be provided the question would be, "Where do we go from here?". This will have to be demonstrated to state and consortium
31. Based on that Valentina's scenario and Adam's point of K-12, the state's response on the K-12 points on the AEBG side was to come with maintenance of effort. The first year, which was the implementation of funds to help K-12 adult schools to get back up to the levels they were at and not the levels at their highest of performance, but a stop-gap measure of where they were and hoping to be
- i. Adam asked if it was not just for where they were at
 - i. It was for where they were at, and what was reported in the last couple of years, but the last couple of years there was a dipping in enrollment because of what was happening in the economy and state.
 - ii. So, a lot of the K-12's were stating that they were only receiving X amount of money, and another year it was a different pot of money, so the MOE received wasn't as high as what funding had been in past years. MOEs were still taken on the 2nd and 3rd year and the following however there is no longer an MOE per say. Now-w the state law is written as: Each member, they are entitled to

receive what they got the year before unless there are certain things that happen. One of those things might be, the Consortium deciding to divert funding to something else and if everyone including that member agrees, that's one way it could be done.

- iii. On the flip side of that scenario, the member who received that funding was not performing, then there is a procedure of what can be done to pull money away due to lack of performance which is a lengthy procedure.
 - iv. The easiest way is if everyone says there is X amount of money that is not needed, and it can be utilized for something else, then the consortium can agree to change/use the funds for a different matter. So, if worst case scenario happened with the funding formula, then the state may need to look as the maintenance of effort for the community colleges or something similar. Community colleges did not receive the maintenance of effort initially because it was still receiving apportionment, and on the Adult Education side – LCFF was no longer being collected for the adult ed. students
- iii. Logic Model
- 1. Handouts provided at meeting, entire PowerPoint was e-mailed to Executive Committee
 - 2. Handout has since been updated, Greg Hill added a few changes
 - i. Evaluation Plans
 - ii. Strategy Inputs
 - iii. Outputs
 - i. What are the activities/products that will be generated from that strategy
 - iv. Outcomes
 - i. Short-Term
 - 1. NOCRC milestones, what do we expect these strategies to do
 - ii. Intermediate
 - 1. Combination of the NOCRC milestones and state outcomes
 - a. Example: Increases in the number of students served
 - iii. Long-Term
 - 1. State Outcomes
 - a. Examples: Improve literacy skills, Completion of high school diploma, Completion of post-secondary, etc.
- iv. Evaluation Plan, Logic Model Discussion
- 1. Steve believes it needs assessment, how to identify the need in the first place?
 - 2. In the original proposal strategy there is an entire section on the needs which is justified for the regional comprehensive plan
 - 3. On the year to year ones, it has not been added, but it may need to be added to show that if it is a new component of the strategy
 - 4. Valentina thinks that even with the existing components we should re-evaluate whether it may be a good idea if it should still be there or not
 - 5. What would be the best way to see it done, on the Logic Model or a narrative at the bottom. What would make sense for Executive Committee to review?
 - 6. Steve says that there have been certain identified needs since the beginning which is a starting place, but the rest is evaluative

- i. Was the need met to a certain extent?
 - ii. Should we continue or change or stop it all together?
 - iii. The logic model should then already be applied to the existence in terms of initial need assessment and the ongoing
7. Jesse added to the beginning of the logic model: Activities, Products, then the Outcome
- i. The progress is typically looked at of the strategies, so the progress will be reported using the same format. (Example: Six months after the approval of a strategy, what were the activities? How many products - student received, were there any short-term/immediate outcomes?)
 - ii. Rather than having bullet points, add another table of progress that aligns back with an update that the Executive Committee will then see every month. Then the same template would be used for planning and evaluating the progress
 - iii. Will have the consistency and one always leads to the next, annual review will be based on the others
 - iv. Raine believes this will help with the workgroup strategy on whether to continue something or not by seeing whether there is a need to continue or if there is something that needs to change
8. Adam Gottdank: questions about outcomes or who is an AEBG student: is it appropriate to help students transition students to a credit Cypress College/Fullerton College or postsecondary? Adam Gottdank's opinion is that this should be done and now looking at the documents (AEBG transitioning to College/Post-Secondary Outcomes with AA Degree) it looks to affirm that doing so is okay to assist all DSS students even on the credit side?
9. Jesse Crete – conversations that Jesse Crete have been a part of, the questions brought up was not whether AEBG can support students who are transitioning to credit sides, because this can happen under AEBG. The question that was present was who is the student that we are helping to transition? Example being: AEBG funds are to be use for 18 and over, noncredit, and adult ed. students, definition in place since AB104 went into law – who is then eligible for the services? Which has been interpreted as K-12 Adult Transition program student, 18-22 students, not an adult program, but if enrolled in NOCE, then they are turned into an adult ed. student due to the mere fact of enrolling them into the NOCE which they can then transition. Can RSP students that are 18 and over, seniors in high school, in a regular K-12 high school that may have a disability be served? The answer was no because that is a K-12, CDE student, department of ed.
10. Steve Zamora – Question: was this because of ADA issues?
11. Jesse Crete – yes
12. Adam Gottdank – transition counseling at this time is being provided by NOCE, so if transition counselors are working with students and they receive NOCE student number/apply to the school and receiving NOCE services, they then are considered “NOCE students”. If the students are getting help with transitioning services to Fullerton College or Cypress college, they are still able to receive NOCE services?
13. Valentina Purtell – this might be good to clarify with the state because it may be an ADA issue, but not in this context because apportionment is not collected on the students and only counseling services is being provided. The question may be, “if serving 18-year-

Commented [KC1]: Not sure if this content is needed. The conversation strayed.

- olds and over who are still enrolled in regular place holds in special ed., do they qualify for AEBG funds?”
14. Connie Van Luit – they do qualify because they’re 18 and over
 15. Valentina Purtell – even if they are enrolled in K-12?
 16. Connie Van Luit – because it is through the transition class
 17. Adam Gottdank - students in the adult transition program for the K-12, they are still receiving services from the K-12 under IDA and the counselors are still helping them transition to postsecondary while they are in the adult transition program. So, with the scenario of providing them services that K-12 is not providing them, which is consistent with the strategy and the Adult Ed Block Grant. Hence, Adam Gottdank believes RSP students should be served for high school diplomas now and help transition to Cypress college or Fullerton college if they are 18 or older.
 18. Jesse Crete – recently asked state and their reply was “no”, but maybe it can be looked into a little more
 19. Steve Zamora – definitions may be separated from mild to moderate to moderate to severe, adults in the adult transition program who may be in the program are moderate to severe and that is used as a benchmark, may be the rationale from the state... Mild to moderate students for the most part is the mainstream in classes which usually are students who are 18-19 during school year, or in a 4 year program... Because of IDA – these are students who go up all the way through ages of 22, but these students are usually considerate moderate to severe students... Steve Zamora is not sure whether this is the demarcation, but believes this may be what the state is looking at
 20. Connie Van Luit – thought it was due to the resource level, because it is known that it can be funded to college, as long as the students are 18 and over and working with the high schools to transition to college just using the resource, no anymore...
 21. Jesse Crete – was told that it was similar to the core education scenario where K-12 are required to provide certain services to transition students over, hence, if AEBG comes into the high schools for anyone that is 18 and over, and not particularly saying DSS, why couldn’t AEBG go into CTE and spend money on the students 18 and over there? It can be any program, but it is supposed to be covered by the CDE funds that the K-12 receives
 22. Adam Gottdank – doesn’t think the K-12s are doing the type of transition counseling that NOCE is doing
 23. Jesse Crete – not saying that they are, but this was just the feedback that Jesse Crete received from state that the K-12s are required to do certain things to get students to transition to college whether or not if they are doing it at that level, was not the question; but it’s just that they were supposed to be doing these things from kindergarten through high school. Hence, the muddy area of the adult transition program was where it was squeezed in, but K-12 are required to provide those services to students and we would like to come in to enhance because it is not a traditional kindergarten through senior year in high school...
 24. Valentina Purtell – if K-12 are required to provide certain support services to these students and we come in to provide additional and maybe different services, would that make a difference? Valentina Purtell doesn’t know

25. Adam Gottdank – if K-12 partners were here they may help with the discussion about providing transition counseling for RSP students to credit since they are familiar with IDA and implementation within their districts. Adam Gottdank understands that compliance with state must be followed, but is not sold that it isn't appropriate and believe that it is a strong need within the region to provide help for the high school students transition successfully to college especially students with Disability because they have the most difficult time transitioning from K-12 to post-secondary college, so there is a definite need within the region without a shadow of a doubt.
26. Jesse Crete – the other side of this conversation is on the credit side, so the question being, can we serve students at arise lab and students who are obtaining credit, but again the understanding about this is choosing to serve that population who is 18 and over and enrolling them into NOCE, but what then is the outcome? There is no outcome being recorded there, but the Consortium can make a strategic decision to serve a population that technically falls under the allowable guidelines. Ex.) a credit student enrolls into NOCE, but what would be the outcome being measured?
27. Adam Gottdank – if there are credit students who are going to a noncredit lab, then they would be an NOCE adult ed. student... There can be outcomes developed, an example for the lab might be where the barriers are identified to success for students with Autism and then you provide services and show that they are gaining skills etc., on a micro level. As for a Macro level, it might be AA degrees, transitions to 4 years...
28. Jesse Crete – not AA degrees, it's for specific certificates that are there. One other option is working with a field team which Valentina Purtell is also on one...
29. Adam Gottdank – on the print out slides, it says "college degree, AA, ASA," – the handouts were a part of the e-mail, full presentation
30. Valentina Purtell – the state is still trying to define its universe and clarify its purpose for AEBG, hence, Valentina Purtell wonders if it would make sense/help if Adam Gottdank/DSS workgroup were to write-out detailed scenarios; who is planned on being served – on the K-12 and credit side, what services would be provided, and what the expected outcome may be? This can then be shared with the AEBG office in which other Consortiums may have asked the same questions.
31. Jesse Crete – agrees, but this still require that the Executive Committee's decision on what is priority for the Consortium and the example is without offense to the transition counselor, but because it was current topic, the example is transition counselors being the most expensive strategy, so the discussion may be whether to expand to serve a larger population, is that the priority that the Executive Committee wants to gear towards? If so, that is okay too
32. Adam Gottdank – that wouldn't be an expansion because it was the idea since the beginning
33. Jesse Crete – clarification, expanding the number of counselors
34. Adam Gottdank – right now that isn't even what is being considered, it's not even a request to ask to increase number of counselors
35. Jesse Crete - another clarification, it's just if there was another expansion that required funding, that would be to the Executive Committee discretion
36. Steve Zamora – just a need for clarity from the state

37. Valentina Purtell – the first time when the strategies were being developed, the lesson learned was that sometimes on the best intentions in developing the strategies, when the time came to implement the strategies and work with certain student populations, the realizations came that other work areas, agencies, departments may be impacted that may have not been in initial conversations like counseling needing other student services. Hence with the current opportunity of planning and building new strategies for the new year, is there a way or should there be a need of creating a checkpoint of some sort of reminder for the workgroups to bring in other services to the discussion that may be impacted when strategies are being implemented?
38. Jesse Crete – that was supposed to be added to the proposed strategy form, but was mistakenly left out, so Jesse Crete will update that
39. Question: Kenia Cueto – clarification on workgroups listed on the logic model example, such as CTE? CTE for ROP is defined differently
40. The logic model is built on current strategies, the logic model isn't for everything that exists. It is just saying that out of everything that is approved in the comprehensive plan, the logic model was built based off that, so ROP isn't really represented as a strategy as is, but that is why each new strategy would have the model to add that component
41. Jesse questioned the proposed strategy plan, for the timeline: is it necessary to specify the timeline, or move to the bottom of the logic model? It might be an extra thing that confuses the logic model? Can it be said this is the activities and go from there or should it just be taken out?
 - i. Steve replies that this might be sub-cumbersome if you try to add it in what you already have going, given what was discussed earlier
 - ii. Jesse agrees, but does the Executive Committee feel there needs to be a written statement somewhere on the bottom, or can the activities be left out and just completed?
 - iii. Adam thinks the logic model is very substantial move forward in accountability and a big shift, so the timeline may not be needed on the bottom
 - iv. Raine says the timeline is just a working guideline for the workgroup to make sure it gets implemented, but it is constantly being changed due to things that come up, so having the activity there and then in the monthly reports to the Executive Committee, it can be addressed in the progress section if there is something that needs to be addressed.
 - v. Ivan thinks it may helpful to define what short-term and intermediate outcomes were, whether short-term means a month, two months, etc. because it may help to know when things need to be completed by
42. Based on conversation with Greg Hill: the short-term, intermediate, and long-term verbiage is not specific to time. It should show NOCRC that would eventually lead to a bigger outcome. So it wouldn't be by month because any of the NOCRC milestones can take a long or short period of time. It should be but what the local milestone is that is expected that influences the outcome of the activities and products
43. There are some areas that shouldn't have ambiguity because some areas there may need to be a specific timeline to which it needs to be there. It may make sense to have a

benchmark on some milestones along the way, whether it is quarterly – that is fine, but annually is too long

i. Jesse clarifies that the evaluation would be done monthly on the progress

44. Raine gave an example, under outcomes, “we want to increase number of students”, but under monthly reports you would define/report the actual number of students, “this month we have 4 workshops, and 100 students who participated”

45. Jesse will be sending out the edited form to the workgroups to use without the benchmarks, with regards to measure of time at the moment and see what happens when the workgroups plug in the data. Then Executive Committee can see it as a draft because the following month the strategies will discuss about how using the form was. Then there will be a clearer picture of what can be defined as benchmarks, but also if edits are needed to be made before the final vote

c. NOCRC Budget

i. Hand-outs were provided for the EC meeting

ii. As of March 1st, 2018, 35% of year-two allocation has been spent, 65% remaining, \$2M, \$385K, \$448 that is listed on the budget report; must be spent by December 31, 2018

iii. 15/16 funds were done December 31st, 2017

iv. 16/17 allocation is due December 2018 – which is the 65% left

1. Picked up significantly on expenses, more hiring has been made, a lot more targeted budgets moving forward

2. Workgroups just received new expenditures but are behind in projections because journal entries had to move money from first year to second year

3. Special Projects Managers are currently looking at projections and what has been encumbered vs. invoices that have not gone through

4. Hope to finish the funds from the second year by summer

5. The Preliminary Allocation came out that was part of the documents handed out and in the Executive Committee e-mail

i. Governor’s Office Proposal – 4% COLA, about \$150K, if allocation is approved – it is about 3.8?

d. NOCRC Database

i. Expenses were not completed until the day of the Executive Committee meeting, not reconciled in time to present

ii. This is the money used to pay for the Prof. Expert, Professional Data Collectors for proctoring and the database being built

1. Steve asked if there was an upfront cost and was there a percentage that was paid to get it started? Any invoices?

2. Jesse Crete - No because nothing has been done yet. An NOCE employee was hired for a month to design the proposal. A meeting is scheduled with the Director of IT to showcase a plan without having to go through a full bidding process so that the design can be created more quickly and the budget to be absorbed faster

a. NOCRC Office Expansion

i. Demolition has completed

ii. Plans are with the city and currently waiting for their approval. Hope to have it by April 19th at the latest

iii. Furniture is being delivered to CBI

b. AEBG Field Teams

- i. Valentina Purtell and Jesse Crete were in Sacramento for event - 5 field teams:
 - 1. Data and Accountability - Valentina Purtell
 - 2. Professional Development – Jesse Crete
 - i. Would like to switch to Member Effectiveness
 - 3. Member Effectiveness (Greg Hill)
 - 4. Pathways
 - 5. Regional Collaboration
- ii. Had introductory meeting to review accountability framework and discuss what was developed over the summer
 - 1. Time to collect data based on outcomes that were developed
 - 2. Supplementary Report – another type of report that includes secondary outcomes and immigration framework

IV. Workgroup Updates

a. SASS

- i. NOCE has asked Erin Sherard to present Love & Logic to the Board Committee members
- ii. Two Lunch and Learn events were held to showcase the new Love and Logic curriculum
 - 1. Kids with Hurtful Past attendance: 69
 - 2. Kids with Special Needs attendance: 50
 - 3. Introduced the new curriculum to add it to the Love & Logic calendar to offer to district partners or anyone else who may be interested
 - 4. Schedules are being looked at for the next NOCE School Year
- iii. Workgroup would like to request approval to create an RQ for 4 staff/faculty members to attend the Love & Logic Conference in Colorado that takes place in June
 - 1. RQs for travel need to be put in by April 17th
 - 2. Request to send 4 people: Erin Sherard (teaching track), Araceli Chavez (teaching track), Renee Day (administrative track), and Cat Guerra (teaching track)
 - 3. Approximately \$7,400 to send all 4 people
 - 4. It would be less expensive to send them to Colorado instead of having Dr. Faye come here to showcase the Love & Logic curriculum, which would cost around \$15K
 - 5. Jesse added that the language of out of state travel was discussed at the previous meeting and it was decided that the Executive Committee must approve all out of state travel
 - i. This request is not for encumbering funds, but will help with putting in a request on time for travel requisition if approved by the Executive Committee
 - ii. Agreement of the group to open a RQ to allow the 4 team members to go out of state for the Love & Logic conference
 - iii. Voting can also be done if the Executive Committee feels comfortable to do so, but at this time, there is nothing in writing to do the vote on, so we can postpone to the next Executive Committee meeting
 - 6. An office motion is not needed, but will be tracked here in the meeting minutes:
 - i. RQ will be created
 - ii. No money will be spent

- iii. Will present for an official vote at next meeting for out of state travel for the 4-people requested
- b. Basic Skills
 - i. Continuing with Direct Instruction for Math and English
 - ii. Gilbert South is getting more students referred, approximately 24 students now
 - iii. El Camino enrollment has not changed
 - 1. Current enrollment is still around 7 per class
 - 2. Banner has been ordered, hoping it will help with enrollment
 - 3. Approximately 18K postcards were sent out
 - i. Only 5 replies overall
 - iv. Working on 2 new strategies
 - 1. GED Direct Instruction
 - i. Select few will be visiting the program in San Bernardino in April to see how they are operating with their Direct Instruction program
 - 2. Mentorship for HS Diploma Students
 - i. Heard great things from ESL and would like to extend the program to Basic Skills students but need to figure out how
 - ii. Need help with outreach and marketing, so various ways are being looked into to minimize the time
 - 1. Possibly designating one person to focus on all the programs or just Basic Skills
- c. CTE/CWG
 - i. Gap Analysis draft was received and will be reviewed, Jesse and Raine will send it out to the Executive Committee when it is finalized and approved
 - ii. The Executive Summary for each program was sent out by Jesse on: NOCE, Fullerton, and Cypress College
 - iii. The entry and re-entry number of students is averaging 12 students per class
 - 1. Last term, the average was 6, so this term has doubled – which is due in part to the Career Pathway Specialist outreaching and engaging with students to help attendance grow
 - iv. Nothing to report on for I-BEST
 - v. Workforce Development is in its 3rd month of the New World of Work, 21st Century Employability workshops
 - 1. The last 2 workshops had approximately 30-31 students
 - 2. Originally only had 7 when it first started
 - 3. Students are requesting more information, offerings, and time
 - 4. The workshops are for any NOCE students
 - 5. One of the goals is to grow it to offer the workshops regionally
 - vi. Today is the first workshop on adaptability
 - vii. Dress for Success was offered earlier today to promote the clothing closet offered at the NOCE campus
 - viii. Career Center
 - 1. Location will be provided at the Anaheim campus before rolling it out at to Wilshire and Cypress sites

2. A place for all students to use the computers and work on Career Coach: an analysis on student's skillset to show what industries or jobs might suit the student and suggestions of what to pursue
 3. Also shows the different educational programs that are offered throughout the district
 4. Students can work on their resumes and interviewing skills with the career coaches (Career Pathways Specialists) that are at the centers to provide one-on-one support
 5. Workshops will also take place at this location
- ix. Elle Navigator – Morning of April 19th is the day that was given to go and talk about the classes
- d. DSS
- i. Arise Lab and Transition Counseling
 1. Extension of Services will be the theme for the next workgroup meeting
 2. Casey Suza will be providing seminars for parents of students with disabilities
 3. Mental Health Update DSS counselors have started on research
 4. One of the colleagues from Fullerton College is looking at CTE certificates that would be for the community in general but also serve students with disabilities
 5. DSS students toured the culinary art programs that Cypress college offers
 - i. 36 students attended
 - ii. Joelle is working on the surveys that the students filled out
 - i. Students were very satisfied and interested in the program
 - ii. Jesse would like Joelle to send out pictures if there are any
- e. ESL
- i. Not looking to add any new strategies, just to modify current ones
 - ii. Conversation about Alignment taking place. There is now a representative from Cypress College, Samantha Simmons, attending the workgroup meetings. She is very interested in the results of the alignment between NOCE and Fullerton college
 - iii. Hope to create an alignment between NOCE and Cypress College in the future
 - iv. Potentially developing a lead mentor for the mentorship program, will be bringing the position to the Executive Committee sometime soon to vote

V. Member Updates

- a. Fullerton College, Steve Zamaro
 - i. No real updates
 - ii. Steve shared that he will be joining the Executive Committee in lieu of Sandi Layana because it makes more sense for him to attend
- b. NOCCCD, Joyce Carrigan
 - i. March 16th, 2018 is the Integrate Planning Summit
 - ii. Recently signed with Strong Workforce regional round to year one, so NOCE will be spearheading work base learning, job placement projects, and the participation agreement has been signed
 - iii. All 3 campus sites are working on round 2, year 2 projects that is due to the district at the end of March in which they will have to decide on their 17%??
- c. Garden Grove, Connie Van Luit
 - i. Just submitted the 3rd year visit from WASC and now working on WIOA



AEBG EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 15, 2018

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

NOCRC Office: Conference Room

- d. Anaheim Union, Ranae Bryant
 - i. Currently on Spring Break
 - ii. TESLA Rack summit

Upcoming EC Meetings: (NOCRC Offices: 505 N Euclid, Suite 200, Anaheim)

Thursday, April 19th 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. (*Draft 2017-18 Strategies & Budgets Presented*)

Thursday, May 17th 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. (*Vote 2017-18 Strategies & Budgets*)

Thursday, June 21st 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Thursday, July 19th 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.



AEBG EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 15, 2018
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
NOCRC Office: Conference Room
