Career and Technical Education (CTE) Deans Meeting  
Monday, October 10, 2005  
Dole Street Conference Room

In attendance: John Carroll (HawCC), Bernadette Howard (HonCC), Mona Lee (KapCC), Earl Nishiguchi (KauCC), Mike Tagawa (LeeCC), Suzette Robinson (MauCC), Sandy Okazaki (WinCC)

Guest: Mike Rota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Notes</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approval of September 1, 2005 minutes</td>
<td>The minutes were approved. Calendar of Perkins Deadlines was distributed. Deans asked for a calendar with Cheryl’s data collection deadlines.</td>
<td>Carol will distribute updated calendar with Cheryl’s deadlines at the November meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Role of CTE Deans (Guest: Mike Rota) | Mike spoke to the Deans about their roles in the context of the Perkins law and changes in the organization of the community colleges within the last 4 years. Points made include:  
a) Per Perkins, money can flow to eligible local entities, i.e., the DOE and the UHCCs (must be less than baccalaureate programs)  
b) 2 years ago, without a CC system office, the eligible entities became the DOE and the 7 community colleges  
c) With only 5% available for administrative costs, the Chancellors asked that we (UHCCs) remain a consortium  
d) The CTE Deans is an advisory group to the Chancellors.  
e) As of June 5, 2005, we have 2 eligible local entities again  
f) The Council of CC Chancellors are advisory to the VP for CCs (John Morton)  
g) It has always been the case that the Chancellors (formerly Provosts) have designated a representative from their campus to help us work out how to spend Perkins funds. (The CTE Deans noted that their group has been in existence for only about 3 years) |
h) Decision-making? VP has ultimate sign-off authority but by and large the advisory committee’s decisions are followed.
i) The Workforce Development (WD) position came as a recommendation from the DOCETs to the Chancellors and the Chancellors approved.
j) Chancellors are responsible for money that goes to the campuses (see assurance form)
k) CTE Deans have a dual role: what is the right thing to do for the system, and making sure their campuses receive their fair shares
l) Look at the big picture (1P1 to 4P2) from a system perspective
m) Look beyond the current year, to the future
n) John Morton has mentioned that he is interested in revisiting how the Perkins money is used and how it gets allocated—1st year funding should go to meeting standards; 2nd year?? John wants to meet with the Chancellors to determine how these monies should be spent, possibly for workforce development
o) Nationally, Perkins budget is about $1 billion, therefore is likely to be refunded
p) The Regents supplemental budget request includes a request for a Rapid Response team (Workforce Development) – although it’s not clear how much, if any money would be spent for personnel costs
q) There is no other G-fund money for the Workforce Development (WD) Officer; only new tuition money, which the system does not receive.
r) We need a clear articulated vision of the WD program for the system, and translate that to campus needs and resources
s) Use Perkins funds to address short-term WD needs
t) Perkins provides equitable opportunity and workforce development
u) The priorities for the CTE Deans should be: (1) meeting standards as a consortium, (2) the upcoming audit in January (30th and 31st), and (3) program/market demand.

| | • We did fairly well with the lapsing (2003-04) funds. Deans felt the procedure we implemented this past year, with mini-grants, worked well and should be tried again.  
| | • Much of the carryover (2004-05) funds have not been awarded because completion reports have not all been completed and submitted.  
| | • Current year funds have been allocated, except for Title II (Tech Prep/Career Pathways) funds that will probably not come in until later this calendar year.  
| | • Carol noted that there may be a possibility that next year (2006-07) Title I Achieving Standards allocations will be awarded only after Program Health Indicator reports have been submitted. Deans asked if Cheryl could inform them after 4/15, which campuses reports were incomplete.  
| | • There was further discussion of PHIs and the setting of the minimum and satisfactory levels. It was decided that the CTE Deans will take this topic to the DOI group.  
| Bernadette will check with her campus re: $5,000 balance of lapsing funds. (done, 10/12/05)  
| Carol will ask Cheryl if she could send out to Chancellors (w/copy to DOIs and CTE Deans “status” reports of PHIs that have not been received. And if this could possibly be sent out monthly or semi-monthly. (Done. Cheryl reported that the DOIs are already copied on the PHI memos)  
| The CTE Deans will take the issue of PHI minimum and satisfactory levels to the DOI group. |

| 4. Non-traditional Committee representatives from each campus | Carol reported on the need to develop a non-traditional committee to develop a low-cost, low-maintenance non-trad recruitment and retention plan this year. She added that she asked the current group of representatives from Barbara Tavares’ efforts if they would be interested in serving, and they suggested that the Deans decide.  
| Carol will send the Deans an email with the list of faculty who were on Barbara Tavares’ committee and solicit a name of one representative for each campus to serve on the NT recruitment and retention plan committee. |

| 5. Review of Leadership Proposals | The Deans reviewed and discussed the proposals and the changes made are reflected in the Leadership spreadsheet. It was also confirmed that this would be the last year that Perkins Leadership funds would support the Kaua‘i and Maui Institutional Research positions.  
| Carol will prepare an updated spreadsheet and send to the CTE Deans. (Done, 10/11/05) Deans will resubmit revised proposals per committee’s discussion. |
| 6. Next Meeting | Agenda items:  
|                | • Karla Jones and the upcoming audit  
|                | • More discussion on the Role of CTE Deans Committee  
|                | • IR System costs  
|                | • Funding the Workforce Development Officer position  
|                | • Expectations of the Workforce Development Officer position  
|                | • Other tabled items  
|                | Thursday, November 10, 2005  
|                | 9 a.m. – 1 p.m.  
|                | Dole Street Conference Room |