



COALITION FOR MULTIPLE PATHWAYS

Policy Development Working Group

Tuesday, March 31, 2009

10:00 AM-1:00 PM

Meeting Notes

Participants

Jay Hansen, State Building and Construction Trades Council of California

Erika Hoffman, California School Boards Association

Karen Humphrey, California Postsecondary Education Commission

Cris Johnson, California Teachers Association

Christy Moustis, Elk Grove Unified School District

Steve Pinning, California Association of Regional Occupational Centers & Programs

Joe Radding, California Department of Education

David Rattray, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce

Lee Angela Reid, Senate Office of Research

Patricia Rucker, California Teachers Association

Jose Hernandez, ConnectEd: The California Center for College and Career

Gary Hoachlander, ConnectEd: The California Center for College and Career

Welcome and Introductions

After introductions, Karen Humphrey announced that she became the Executive Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. All congratulated her. Participants welcomed Jay Hansen as a new member of the Coalition.

Establishing Goals for Policy Priorities

Participants were asked to review the 10 policy recommendations for 2009-2010. In the context of the current budget –both Federal and state- the immediate priorities for the coming year included:

1. **District Initiative:** It was agreed that incorporating the priorities into the District Initiative context would be necessary. This is especially true for curriculum and instruction as it pertains to teacher preparation.
2. **Data Systems:** Data systems need to be devised to further the development of tracking students after graduation. What is the state's role in this? It was agreed that there should be linkages in data collection across organizations. The Coalition could help build a vision for this system. Gathering data on secondary retention in multiple pathways programs (not just postsecondary) would also be useful. In order to demonstrate that this works (i.e. that drop-out rates are reduced, there is an increase in achievement to postsecondary transition, etc.), there needs to be integrated curriculum that includes both the career technical and academic side. In addition, teachers from the technical side are vital in applying the technical skills to expand this effort.

3. **Teacher Preparation:** The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL) will be holding three workshops in Sacramento based on their report, which focuses on research in teacher preparation, and the recruitment and support of training. It was recommended that some working group members try to attend these workshops. It was also suggested that district representatives attend, especially given that budget cuts are forcing some CTE teachers to leave, and the need for training newer teachers is very strong. It would be amiable to connect CTE teachers that are being laid off, into places where they are needed. Lee Angela reported that the LAO report is in its final steps and the recommendations for teacher preparation are under approval, but the final decisions will be made soon.
4. **State Support:** Finding out where the state stands on curriculum development as part of its overall plan would be helpful. SB 70 funds could be a source of funding. Knowing what the state plan is will prevent the Coalition from duplicating any work in this area that is already being done. It is also crucial to gain state buy-in to help move multiple pathways forward. This would also make the districts confident in moving forward. Admittedly, there is a disconnect between the PI schools and the multiple pathways approach. Districts need advice on how to use money to move forward with multiple pathways. Could the state board use multiple pathways explicitly as an appropriate strategy for high school reform?

Patricia reminded participants that norms should be established in developing these strategies, especially with common stakeholders.

Collaboration

To achieve these goals, it was reiterated that more cross-departmental discussion is necessary. Policy working group members need to collaborate more. The AB 2648 meeting, which takes place on April 15th, is a good example of how members might join together, since several are already attending. Keeping each other informed, and cross collaborating will help solidify the group's efforts. It was also suggested that the Legislative Affairs Office be invited to these meetings to get everyone on the same page. At the AB 2648 meeting, a diversity of voices is necessary. But Jose also suggested that Joe Radding might take on a stronger role as a representative of the Coalition for this event. Jay Hansen added that he might be able to have a discussion with the Superintendent's office (or Chris Reefe) on how more collaboration can be obtained. Jose reminded all that the districts that receive implementation grants will look toward providing answers to the questions and priorities in the policy recommendations.

Legislative Watch

Since bills have the power to influence multiple pathways, what should the process be for the Coalition to aid in this effort?

Before beginning the discussion, Gary wanted participants to keep in mind that the Coalition exists as its own entity, and it is not intended to explicitly move ConnectEd's agenda forward.

Participants were asked to review the Legislative Watch. Karen suggested targeting a few bills to focus energy on. Jose added that it might be good to reintroduce the Brown Bag discussions and engage legislative staff to focus on policy issues. Lee Angela stated that it would be helpful to have presentations to both education

committees on the Coalition's efforts. Patricia and Lee Angela will discuss a way to make this a possibility. Patricia suggested that the Brown Bag discussions might focus on SB 675 (Clean Technology facilities) and AB 35 (Workforce Preparation). Gary cautioned that an obstacle of 1D money is that it is limited in building collective classrooms/labs in a way that connects the CTE buildings to the rest of the high school. Therefore, it can easily reproduce isolation, so those leading the discussion for SB 675 should be mindful of this. Jay agreed that there should be more expansive language for 1D. Patricia added that *how* to leverage the money should also be a focus of SB 675.

In conclusion, Jose highlighted the five areas that members connected the most to for the Brown Bag lunch sessions:

1. State Support
2. Curriculum
3. Teacher Preparation (Ducheny's bill)
4. Alignment (discuss longitudinal data)
5. Funding (1D conversation included)

More recommendations for the Legislative Watch were given. Jose will begin to add in a support/opposition column as the Legislative Watch is updated. Another idea will be for Coalition members to begin sharing letters of support with one another. Patricia will develop a process for sharing these so that it is fair and equitable. Karen suggested sharing these letters online so that they are in one place. As long as it relates to multiple pathways development, Jose will explore the possibility of creating a link for Coalition members on the ConnectEd website (as viewed from a committee analysis standpoint), to share these letters.

Federal Funding

What active steps should the Coalition take at the local and state level to maximize funding from the Federal government?

Based on the Obama administration's approach of holding state governors accountable, the assumption is that federal money will be given to the Governor's and Secretary of Education offices. The money will most likely be distributed to districts quickly. The decision of where the money will flow to seems to hint at funding effective designs that are already in place, to enable continued growth. This would come from the "Innovation" funds. Gary added that some federal money will be given to districts working in collaboration with non-profits. This would be a great opportunity for ConnectEd to work with more districts (especially ones that applied for the original planning grant). ConnectEd hopes to receive this "What Works" money to fund additional districts. The CPA report and other data should be able to serve as evidence that pathways work for justification of receiving these funds.

Participants began to brainstorm ways to collaborate on funding. Jose mentioned that there are 23 districts that are a part of the Coalition, and that there should be some way to disseminate information to them. The CTA has created relationships with local workforce investment boards to support current programs out there. But how should the Coalition support Federal investment for district-wide expansion? Gary said ConnectEd's intention is to expand up to 15-20 districts, but it will need the capacity to ensure that these are carried out with quality. Other ideas to investigate were:

- Patty Murray’s bill “Promoting Innovations for the 21st Century,” which is fashioned after the AB 2648 bill.
- Using the NCLB (ESEA) as an umbrella –(NCLB will most likely be rebranded by Arne Duncan)
- Looking at the “Renaissance Project” in Chicago (which is much like a multiple pathways approach)
- Looking at the “Emerald Cities” Program –to tie workforce development to stimulus money (especially keeping the green opportunities in mind)

There is speculation that the RFP may be given in early June, with an August due date, but the funding may not flow until the end of the year. David suggested collaborating on the RFP would be beneficial. Patricia added that members should think about expected outcomes. Joe advised participants that there may be additional data collection, reporting, professional development and measurement requirements. However, there may be more flexibility with categorical funding once funding reaches school sites.

Future Meeting Participation

There was agreement among participants that there needs to be more representation from the WIB, labor, community colleges, and postsecondary at the working group meetings. The working group will try to reach out to Jack Scott’s office and Karen will try to engage postsecondary representatives.

Meeting Dates

Jose asked for input on the best times for holding these meetings. Most agreed that Thursday and Friday afternoons work well. There will be a plan to schedule four to five Brown Bag sessions. The next three Policy Working Group meetings are scheduled on the following dates:

1. Monday, May 11th 10:00 AM-12:00 PM –Workforce Investment
2. Friday, June 19th, 10:00 AM-1:00 PM –Bonds
3. Monday, July 20th, 10:00 AM-12:00 PM –Program Improvement