WORKFORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes
December 17, 2014, 12:00pm – 1:30pm
Board Room, Building 1000

Members Present:
Dan Fey – Dean, Workforce Education SCC
Faith Lam – Administrative Assistant, Workforce Education, SCC
Stephanie Tschanz – Employment Security Rep
Shelby Creager – Financial Aid Program Specialist, SCC
Kim Cambern – Worker Retraining Program Specialist, SCC
Juliet Scarpa – Assistant Director of Institutional Assessment & Data Management, SCC
Louis Petruzzella – Director of Clean Energy Technology & Entrepreneurship Program, SCC
Kevin Conefrey – VP of Human Resources, First Choice Health
Pamela Gee-Oliver – Human Resources, Bio-Rad Laboratories
Gordon M. Denby – Senior Principal, GeoEngineers

Members Introduction

Agenda Overview

Review and Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting
  ➢ Minutes from the May 20, 2014 meeting was approved

Review of the Role of the Committee and Strategic Direction of the Committee
  ➢ Dan Fey brought up the question regarding the role/strategic direction of the committee
  ➢ Per the Advisory Committee Handbook, advisory committees are instituted as forums for industry representatives to provide curriculum input and align program offerings with industry needs; advisory committees are required to meet at least twice a year in fall and spring
  ➢ Dan elaborated on what differentiates the Workforce Advisory Committee from other advisory committees: while many advisory committees are program specific, the Workforce Advisory Committee should serve as an overarching advisory body to other program-specific advisory committees by strategically synthesizing the works of those advisory committees and the goal of the Worker Retraining program
  ➢ Pam suggested that, given the goal of the committee, the group should recruit new members and generate greater involvement
Discussion on Advisory Committee Effectiveness

- Dan referred to P.8 & 9 of the Advisory Committee Handbook on the main objectives of advisory committees: provide curriculum advice; connect instruction and industry needs; assist with facilities and equipment budget estimation; improve instructional quality; review enrollment and completion data and instructional delivery; assist with student employment, and represent SCC in the community.

- Given the objectives and orientation of the Workforce Advisory Committee, Dan suggested looking into joint meeting or strategic planning sessions with other advisory committees.

- Gordon suggested developing quantitative and qualitative measurement matrices to measure advisory committee effectiveness and the committee’s impact on the college and the community.

- Kevin asked the committee to factor in the committee’s impact on student experience at SCC (student success, return rate on Worker Retraining funds) when measuring its effectiveness.

- Members agreed with Gordon and Kevin’s suggestion.

- Dan suggested that Perkins grant and Worker Retraining grant should complement each other and the committee should also help strategically maximize the use of these two funds.

Discussion on the Advisory Committee and Its Connection to the Worker Retraining Program

- In regards to the committee’s role in projecting future Workforce needs, Kim observed a lack of flexibility in the committee. Kim’s impression is that the committee has not be able to respond to forecasted industry needs and develop corresponding training programs swiftly; the advisory committee has been more reactive than proactive.

- Kim’s suggestion: add a new eligibility criteria for receiving Worker Retraining: vulnerable workers – workers who are currently employed but in jeopardy of losing employment in near future.

- The committee will be voting on whether to add vulnerable worker as a new criteria.

- The State has added 2 new eligible categories for Worker Retraining: military personnel who is on active duty but received separation and people who are in stopgap employment.

Discussion on Potential Objectives for Future Meetings

- Members suggested creating matrices to measure advisory committee effectiveness – inward looking matrix that evaluates the current works of the College and outward looking matrix that forecasts future trends and guides the future direction of the College.

- Pam suggested inviting students to attend advisory committee meetings.
Gordon proposed reviewing 4 prof-tech areas in each future meeting and joint advisory committees with other community and technical colleges

Dan proposed an additional meeting in the winter

**Labor Market Trends Update from Stephanie Tschanz:**

- Summary: Both King and Snohomish counties have lower unemployment rate than the WA State as a whole. The current WA State unemployment rate is 6.2%, King County at 4.5%, and Snohomish County at 4.8%

- Largest employment in construction, education, health services employment; and biggest employment loss in government jobs

- For King County specifically, growth in the construction industry is expected to be strong and services providing industries account for 87% of all employment in the King County; for Snohomish County, high growth is also expected in construction and manufacturing

- King County’s educational demographics: 92% of King County residents have high school completion, 46% with a bachelor’s degree or higher; in comparison, 31% of WA residents hold bachelors’ degree or higher

- Gordon suggested presenting the data in graphs; Juliet volunteered to provide visuals for the data

**Additional Updates from Members:**

- Juliet Scarpa provided an overview on 4 SCC prof-tech programs: Nursing, Automotive, Manufacturing, and Health Informatics and Information Management

- Currently, the Nursing program has an estimated employment rate of 97%; 96% for Automotive; 73% for Manufacturing; and 74% for Health Informatics and Information Management

- Members agreed that it would be useful to take a look at a couple of industry areas during each meeting as Gordon suggested

- Kim gave a list of major layoffs from regional corporations Group Health, Microsoft, Boeing, United Airlines, Century Link and emphasized again that given the low current Worker Retraining FTE rate, there is a need for the committee to vote to decide whether to add vulnerable workers as a new eligibility criteria to Worker Retraining

- Louise Petruzella’s presentation will be moved to the next meeting

- In closing, Dan mentioned again there will be a possible meeting again in the winter

**Meeting Adjourned at 1:35pm**

Minutes taken by Faith Lam