



# Career Technical Education (CTE) Programs Educational Summary

Presented to the Skyline College Academic Senate

Dr. Ronda Wimmer

May 16, 2019

## CTE Strong Work Force Funding

2017 - California infused \$6 million into community colleges specifically to promote CTE programs.

**The goal** is to train skills, requiring a credential rather than a degree, and place one million workers in middle skill jobs.



**In response to** projections indicating people of color will represent half of the consumers and working population.



**Translates into an** economic imperative to close the education and skills gap to ensure that all populations have equal access.

**Result** implementing a “rebranding” campaign to compete with for-profit colleges on marketing and “eliminate the lingering stigma” associated with CTE and to increase the number of -  
**high quality and sustainable CTE Programs.**

## Overview 2016 – 2019 CTE Strong Workforce Program Investments

	2016-2017 \$200 million - Strong Workforce Program investments	2017-2018 \$248 million - Strong Workforce Program investments	2018-2019 \$248 million - Strong Workforce Program investments
<b>State Budget</b>	<p><b>Funding to improve the quality and increase the quantity of career technical education (CTE).</b> A corresponding trailer bill required the Chancellor’s Office to <b>allocate at least 95% of these funds to regions and districts based on the following three factors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Job openings</li> <li>• Unemployed adults</li> <li>• CTE full-time equivalent students</li> </ul>	<p><b>Round 1 - 2015/2017 - in motion to <i>create ‘more and better CTE’ courses, programs and pathways.</i></b></p> <p><b>Round 2 – <i>state encourages braiding</i> these critical <i>dollars</i> to deliver ‘more and better CTE’ that propel <i>towards the outcomes listed below.</i></b></p>	<p><b>Beginning in 2018-19, the <i>full set of Strong Work force Program metrics were activated.</i></b></p>
<b>Statewide Vision for Success</b>	<p>Board of Governor outline six ambitious goals, focus and greater attainment for California community colleges to achieve by 2022:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Increase 20%</b> the number of students achieving <b><i>degrees annually.</i></b></li> <li>2. <b>Increase 35%</b> the number of students <b><i>transferring to CSU or UC.</i></b></li> <li>3. <b>Decrease average number of units accumulated</b> from 89 total units (recent statewide average) to 79 units.</li> <li>4. <b>Increase CTE students report being employed in their field</b> of study <b><i>from 60% to 69%.</i></b></li> <li>5. <b>Reduce equity gaps across all above measures – goal cutting achievement gaps 40% within 5 yrs and completely within 10 yrs.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Reduce regional achievement gaps across all above measures within 10 yrs.</b></li> </ol>		
<b>Allocations</b>	San Mateo - <b>-\$2,076,866</b>	San Mateo District – <b>-\$2,109,235</b>	San Mateo District - <b>-\$2,537,604</b> <b>Skyline College - \$164,924</b> <b>San Mateo College - \$143,257</b> <b>Canada College - \$103,510</b>

# Current CTE Programs

---

**CTE Programs – 15**

**Degrees offered – 21**

**Certificates Offered – 53**

**Total Degrees & Certificates = 74**

## Types of Certificates:

**Certificate of Achievement**  
(generally 12-30 units) – **27**

**Certificate of Specialization**  
(generally 12-17.5 units) – **6**

**Skills or Career Certificate**  
(fewer than 12 units) – **20**

# Traditionally Reasons Students Choose CTE Programs:

---

**1) *Testing the waters***

**2) *Gain certification for specific area of study to gain employment***

**3) *Alternative to achieving a degree***

**4) *Complete certificate to gain employment, while achieving degree***

**5) *Career transitions***

**6) *Additional education*** (continuing education units) to maintain certificates and /or licenses required for some professions

**7) *Hone in current skill sets*** to increase economic sustainability

**8) *Alternative route and/or to bide time for waiting to get into impacted degree programs***

**9) *Lifelong learning*** taking courses due to interest



# California Community College CTE Program Known Nuances & Variances :

- 1. Expensive to operate.**
- 2. Demanding external standards** Some have **very high unit loads.**
- 3. Accelerated and “content full”** and must accommodate underprepared students.
- 4. Limitations involving enrollment, class size restrictions,** as well as facilities associated **with critical safety issues.**
- 5. Information obtained directly from the respective programs discipline experts.**
- 7. Robust curriculum** to **withstand** the **test of time,** allows for adaption and sustainability.
- 8. Some** are **lab intensive.**
- 9. Some lead to transfer as well as associate degrees**
- 10. Mandatory advisory groups.**
- 11. Some** programs can implement **Cooperative Work Experience that provides elective instruction to all students.** These are approved courses with CORs meeting the same rigor of any other course.
- 12. All CTE courses or programs with prerequisites must have the prerequisites reviewed every two years.**

# Known Stigmas and Challenges Associated with CTE programs

---

- 1) In general it's a tough sell
- 2) Lack of trust with CTE programs credibility due to private post-secondary school closures
- 3) Marketing
- 4) Lack of knowledge
- 5) Awareness of CTE programs is high lack: however, understanding about CTE programs are low
- 6) Public and academic perception and stigmas associated with CTE
- 7) Not enough currency with students and parents

# Types of CTE Certificates/Degrees

<p><i>No program oversight or state oversight implementing uniform standards.</i></p>	<p><i>Program oversight accreditation/approval, no required exam for licensure/certification to for employment.</i></p> <p><i>May have National certification that is optional.</i></p>	<p><i>Programs requiring licensure or certification with passing associated exam.</i></p> <p><i>These programs have state oversight, governing laws and/or regulations, that dictate what these professions can and cannot do.</i></p> <p><i>Limited to specific education, experience and demonstrated competency to which the laws allow.</i></p> <p><i>To practice and/or implement beyond those parameters is considered illegal</i></p>
<p><b>(47/74 = 64%)</b></p>	<p><b>(15/74 = 20%)</b></p>	<p><b>(11/74 = 15%)</b></p>



# Challenges & Concerns

**ASCCC Position –opposes performance-based funding** based on the lack of evidence for its effectiveness, the potential impact on academic rigor, and concerns regarding the incentives it creates.



**Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) introduces new pressure on the colleges**



**Generating concerns for both faculty and administration as the goal and implementation in many instances are contradictory.**

Financially incentivizing the conferring of awards as a means of maximizing funding is not consistent with the ultimate goal of increasing student success and accurately measuring student success.

This potential outcome that is detrimental to students is one of the many reasons that ASCCC continues to stand firmly behind its opposition to any form of performance-based funding.



# Dilemma & Faculty Concerns

## Implementation inconsistencies regarding student readiness – Putting this into context:

**On one hand** – decreasing time it takes for completion of certificates to meet the academic year completion rates in order to gain funds for Student Centered Funding Formula for each institution. Faculty concern administration pressuring certain programs to decrease length of certificates to meet these goals.

**On the other hand** – concerns around administration pressuring Deans/faculty to decrease the time it takes to for students to get through an already “accelerated”, “robust”, “content full”, and “some high unit load” program/s and still maintain “**high quality and sustainable CTE Programs**” as the stated intent of strong work force. Faculty concerns this poses questions with regards to integrity of academic rigor. This raises the question - how is this supporting student readiness as a “student-focused” campus promoting sustainability and high quality CTE programs? And how is this supporting “student success”?

This is concerning to faculty that must implement and maintain specific professional standards, for some scope of practice/licensure standards, especially for those programs with external standards, with oversight associated with state and/or local laws.

***Some programs are held accountable for exam pass rates*** that affect their program’s accreditation/approval status.



# Faculty Concerns

## Interwoven issues associated with Academic Senate, AFT and Curriculum

***Faculty shouldering a great deal more responsibilities***, without compensation, in many cases that is time intensive insidiously shifting faculty responsibilities from students and teaching. Many of those responsibilities are administrative and taking away from the faculty's ability to be student ready. This is magnified with those teaching online courses.

**Lack of clarity associated with specific roles and associated responsibilities with coordinators and faculty.**

**Non-discipline experts representing disciplines** – begs the question - how can individuals maintain professional standards and, in some cases external regulatory standards, for a particular discipline if there lacks experience and expertise required for those disciplines, and their associated nuances, that is in the best interest of our students and programs success?

**Coordination compensation inconsistent among CTE programs** – many coordinators are getting some form of compensation. This raises the question - why are other full time faculty coordinators not being compensated? Some faculty feel they are shouldering the responsibility of two-three people, as well as external requirements, for one full time faculty member programs – which is well beyond contract obligations and does this support student readiness?

***Coordination implemented by non-discipline experts*** poses concerns, justified, that have negatively impacted some of the programs and their respective students.



# Faculty Concerns & Inconsistencies:

---

**Class cancellations** – addressed previously within our meetings. Inconsistent with number of students being used as the criteria for class cancellations and inconsistencies as to when these classes get cancelled (week of or 6 weeks prior).

***Viability of programs*** – programs with enrollment restrictions, students forced to take CTE programs as full time, condensing already accelerated, robust curriculum to meet a 2 semester implementation. Begs the question – how does this support student success and student readiness if students are unable to handle the rigor of the course due to students schedule, especially evening students in particular? With this implementation – concerns some faculty feel they are being pressured (forced in some instances) to decrease the academic rigor in order to meet this new budgetary criteria? Is this not contradictory to being a student-focused campus and being student ready?

**LOAD** (enrollments) – concerns with institutional support geared towards programs with High School oriented demographics. What about those programs that do not meet this criteria?

**Advertising** – faculty having to do the advertising in addition to contractual responsibilities and also shouldering the external responsibilities associated with laws and regulations requirements. This is challenging, at best, especially for programs with one, full time, faculty member shouldering most, if not all, the responsibilities for that program.

**Equality and equity associated with promoting programs.**

**Institutional political barriers**