



# COALITION FOR MULTIPLE PATHWAYS

## Policy Development Working Group

Wednesday, July 16, 2008

### Meeting Notes

#### Participants

Pamela Bachilla, California Regional Occupational Centers & Programs  
Bob Biddle (for Michele Siqueiros and Jessie Ryan), Campaign for College Opportunity  
Charlie Dayton, Career Academy Support Network  
Paul Gussman, California Department of Education  
Penni Hansen, California Department of Education  
Erika Hoffman, California School Boards Association  
John Hooper, CalChamber  
Mallory Angeli (for Karen Humphrey), California Postsecondary Education Commission  
Cris Johnson, California Teacher Association  
Brian Lee, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, CA  
Colin Miller, California Charter School Association  
George Montgomery, California Association of School Counselors  
Laura Preston, Association of California School Administrators  
David Rattray, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce  
Chris Reeve, California Department of Education  
Lee Angela Reid, Senate Office of Research  
Ana Rodriguez, Office of Senator Wiggins  
Helen Torres, Hispanas Organized for Political Equality  
and  
Gary Hoachlander, Roman Stearns, Jose Hernandez, & Candace Hamilton,  
ConnectEd: The California Center for College and Career

#### Welcome & Introductions

Gary Hoachlander, President of ConnectEd, introduced himself, ConnectEd staff, and asked participants to introduce themselves.

Gary reminded participants that the Coalition for Multiple Pathways was formally launched in May to demonstrate the broad-ranging support among business, education, and community organizations to expand student access to multiple pathway options. Following the launch, the Policy Development Working Group will help establish priorities in state and local policy to support the expansion of multiple pathways. This first meeting of the Working Group will focus on establishing procedures to guide effective functioning of the working group and establishing policy priorities.

In order to ensure a common understanding of "multiple pathways," Gary provided an overview of the guiding principles and core components.

#### Meeting Objectives

Roman reviewed the proposed objectives for this first meeting of the Policy Development Working Group:

1. Establish structure and operating procedures for the working group
  - a. Agree on the group's goal and 2008 objectives
  - b. Build trust and a sense of collaboration so that all members feel comfortable participating and supporting Coalition objectives

- c. Establish preferences to guide the operations of the working group, e.g., a decision-making model, frequency and location of meetings, and individual and organizational roles
2. Establish Policy Priorities for 2009-10

## **Goal & 2008 Objectives**

Roman then shared the proposed Working Group goal and objectives, listed below, and asked if there were any objections and/or if participants had suggested additions or changes.

### **Proposed Goal:**

Leverage the strength and diversity of the Coalition for Multiple Pathways to guide policy that promotes expansion of pathway options for California youth

### **Proposed 2008 Objectives:**

1. Determine policy priorities for the 2009-2010 legislative session
2. Introduce and guide the passage of 3-5 bills during the 2009-10 legislative session to be sponsored by Coalition members and supported by the Coalition
3. Brainstorm ideas to be developed and pursued in 2011-12 legislative session

## **Comments**

David Rattray questioned whether the Working Group should be involved in guiding the CDE and the LAO, respectively, should AB 2648 and/or SB1677 pass and signed into law by the Governor. Discussion was inconclusive, but it may be appropriate for at least several members of the Working Group to engage with the CDE and the LAO.

David also questioned whether the Working Group should have an explicit objective to work with Senator Pro Temp Steinberg, as his primary focus will be high school reform. The group believed this will become an important strategy, but that it is essential to also engage other legislators.

Paul Gussman reminded the group that the State CTE Plan has recently been approved by the Feds and suggested that we conduct a mapping of resources to determine gaps and networking opportunities.

George Montgomery suggested that we need some operational funds to measure results of multiple pathway programs and demonstrate accountability for achievement gains.

Lee Angela Reid suggested that, in addition to the Working Group of the Coalition, we need to establish a Coalition of legislative staffers to work hand-in-hand with the Working Group to coordinate the introduction of bills and ensure that policy focuses on removing barriers for districts.

Cris Johnson and Jose Hernandez suggested that the answers to many of these questions will emerge as we consider policy ideas. With that suggestion, the group transitioned to the next item on the agenda.

## **Operating Preferences**

Roman stated that ConnectEd prefers not to create an overly formalized structure for the Working Group, but that we conduct business in a way that allows the Coalition, to the degree possible, to speak with one voice. He also suggested that we meet frequently (i.e., monthly) to begin in order to discuss issues and establish priorities.

Lee Angela Reid suggested that the group develop a broader master plan, guided by a clearly stated goal. Discussions of the Working Group should be focused on getting to the issues and knowing each others' concerns and barriers, rather than simply promoting legislation. We also

need to consider key players who are not in the room (e.g., Dept of Finance, State Board of Education).

Erika Hoffman presented the reality that, although everyone around the table may agree conceptually with expanding pathways and may like to support any policy ideas that come from the group, each organization has its own legislative committee that must determine the organizations position. As such, establishing a decision-making structure for the Working Group may be premature, and ultimately not feasible.

Gary Hoachlander suggested using Working Group meetings as a forum for discussion about pathway implementation and the policies that support it. ConnectEd recognizes that many, if not all members of the Coalition, have their own legislative agendas that may or may not intersect with multiple pathways, as well as an internal process they are obligated to follow. So, it is inevitable that we may not always agree. We should acknowledge that up front. If, down the road, we need a more formal process for dealing with dissention, we can deal with that when the time comes.

John Hooper and Paul Gussman reinforced Gary's comments. John suggested that we become clear on the parameters for the group's work.

Both David Rattray and Paul Gussman suggested that the group consider when to lead with policy changes and when practice should lead policy changes.

Laura Preston suggested that there may be two viable strategies for pursuing policy ideas. Either the Coalition Working Group could agree on a policy direction and member organizations can bring in staff to support it, or Working Group members can bring policy ideas to their respective organizations and they can promote them from within their respective organizations. Roman commented that it could be a combination of the two, and Gary stated that this kind of mutual support and flexible forms of operating clarifies our view of how the Coalition can and should promote policy.

## **Policy Priorities**

Roman introduced an exercise intended to establish policy priorities. After Gary reviewed the 10 policy areas described in ConnectEd's policy guide, each participant was asked to consider the following five "filters" and select three policy areas that he/she believes to be of highest priority.

Filtering questions:

1. **COST PRESSURE:** Given the current budget situation, which policy areas may be addressed with no or minimal cost pressure on the general fund?
2. **POLITICAL WILL:** For which of these policy areas might there be the most political will and/or energy to advance?
3. **LEVER FOR CHANGE:** Which of these policy areas provide the greatest potential to be a lever for change?
4. **IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS:** For which of these policy areas are there substantial implementation barriers that must be removed through policy?
5. **PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH:** For which of these policy areas might it be as/more effective to overlook state policy and focus on program implementation?

During the process, two modifications were suggested and accepted: (1) Alignment with Postsecondary was expanded to include Postsecondary *and the Economy*, and (2) Teacher Preparation was expanded to include *Teacher, Counselor, and Administrator Preparation*, thus combining it with elements of Strong Leadership and Support Services.

The exercise yielded the following results. As such, the decision was made to focus the Working Group's attention on

- (1) Teacher, Counselor, and Administrator Preparation and Development;**
- (2) Alignment with Postsecondary Education and the Economy;**
- (3) Curriculum & Instruction; and**
- (4) State Endorsement of Multiple Pathways.**

| <b>Policy Areas</b>                     | <b>Votes</b> |
|---|--------------|
| State Endorsement of MP                 | 6            |
| Curriculum & Instruction                | 7            |
| Work-based Learning                     | 1            |
| Student Support Services                | 1            |
| Teacher Preparation & Development       | 9            |
| Regional Implementation                 | 2            |
| Scheduling & Instructional Time         | 0            |
| Alignment w/ Postsecondary Education    | 9            |
| Strong Leadership                       | 5            |
| Assessment, Accountability & Evaluation | 4            |

Several participants commented on the interrelationship between and among the various policy areas. That is evident. This process was intended to establish the starting points. As these areas are discussed, participants should feel free to discuss the overlap and potential for combining policy areas when it makes sense to do so.

Gary summarized the results of the exercise by suggesting that, as a group, we focus our energy in the coming months on State Endorsement of Multiple Pathways. It is difficult to focus on Teacher Preparation and Leadership Development in isolation of Curriculum and Instruction. They have to go together. Finally, in order to be really clear about multiple pathways as gateway into Postsecondary education/training and life, we have to talk about it in a more coherent way. So, we need to focus on those four as areas of concentration, not isolation.

Roman asked the group’s recommendation on strategies to pursue these priority areas. Paul Gussman suggested that we begin by doing an analysis of each of the four areas, asking: Where have we been? Where are we now? Where are we going? Lee Angela suggested that we identify members of the Coalition that have expertise in these areas and utilize those resources. Erika suggested that we take time to identify the implementation barriers that should be removed through policy.

Jose Hernandez reminded the group that we already have about 100 different specific policy recommendations that have been generated through ConnectEd hosted Brown Bag Lunch Discussions, Stakeholder Meetings, Policy Site Visits, and the Coalition Launch event. ConnectEd can and should synthesize them, by policy area, and distribute them to the group as food for thought during future discussions. Paul suggested that the Pathway Development Working Group align with the same four focus areas in order to have a more coherent statewide approach to pathway expansion.

As a structure for future meetings of the Working Group, Gary suggested that we focus on one policy area at each of the next four meetings beginning in August with Curriculum & Instruction because we have to begin with content. Then, in September, move to Teacher Preparation & Development; in October, address Alignment with Postsecondary and the Economy; and finally, in November, finish with State Endorsement of Multiple Pathways. At that point, we should evaluate whether any clarity has emerged. ConnectEd will develop the agenda. Others can/should identify resources and, ideally, send them out in advance.

## **Next Steps**

ConnectEd will distribute meeting notes and survey the group about potential dates for future meetings. ConnectEd will develop the agenda for future meetings and gather resources.

ConnectEd will consolidate the 100+ policy recommendations from earlier events into priority areas

ConnectEd will review past proposals related to policy

ConnectEd will get feedback from working group members that were unable to participate in call

ConnectEd will establish a 6 month calendar for the working group – meetings, deadlines, briefings, events

ConnectEd will begin an e-mail discussion on upcoming policy issues