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THE VISION

- The community colleges are an effective and central part of a unified approach to workforce development in California—one that is founded on career ladders, universal, seamless, regional, strategic and collaborative.

- All the components of the workforce development system are working together in an integrated fashion. A system of career ladders provides opportunity for all Californians to attain jobs that provide a living wage and to advance to positions requiring greater skills, responsibilities, and accordingly, higher pay.

- Employer needs are better met, and workforce and economic development in California is enhanced by the increasing supply of skilled workers.

(Ladders of Opportunity, BOG-CCC 2001)
Career Ladders can help students:

- Move within and across programs in the college
- Move between the college and other educational institutions
- Benefit from the multiple missions of the CCC’s – basic skills, vocational education, general education, and transfer
- Move along educational and career pathways
- Obtain jobs at living wages with prospects for advancement
Sample Colleges

- Butte College
- City College of San Francisco
- College of the Canyons
- College of the Redwoods
- Fresno City College
- Hartnell College
- Los Angeles Southwest College
- Sacramento City College
- San Diego City College
- Santiago Canyon
- Skyline College (pilot site)
Interviews

At colleges:
- 134 total interviews
- 155 total participants
- Variety of positions
  (including college leadership, program leadership, faculty, support services staff)

External partners:
- Workforce Investment Boards
- Business and Industry
- Community Based Organizations
- Labor
- Government Agencies
- Other Educational Entities
Key Elements

- Overall Fit w/ Career Ladders
- Career Pathways
- Use of Funding Sources
- Innovation & Flexibility
- Internal Curriculum Integration
- External Curriculum Integration
- Partnership with business, industry
- Partnership with CBO’s, WIB’s, others
- Regional Cooperation
- Integration of Student Services
- Work-based learning
## Six Point Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>missing, not happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>awareness of need, under discussion but not in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>happening, but only at a minimal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>in use, effective for some but not all, needs enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>strong implementation, ongoing practice, effective for those involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>particularly effective, a best practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Career Ladders Fit

The diagram shows the career ladder fit scores for different colleges and the overall average. The colleges are listed as College C, College D, College A, College E, College G, College J, College H, College F, College B, and College I. The scores range from 0 to 5, with the following values:

- College C: 3.00
- College D: 2.89
- College A: 2.75
- College E: 2.62
- College G: 2.47
- College J: 2.27
- College H: 2.27
- College F: 1.90
- College B: 1.77
- College I: 1.20
- All Colleges: 2.38

The highest score is for College C, and the lowest is for College I.
Key Elements for a Single College

- B/I
- CBO/WIB
- Int. Integration
- Ext. Integration
- Innovation
- Career Pthway
- St. Svcs
- Regional
- WBL
- Funding
Capacity: High Cost - High Demand

The state needs to make sure there is money allocated for start-up costs, differential funding for different programs based on cost, and size. Nursing is a killer and many colleges are deciding to close down these types of programs. President

As other programs are shrinking in our surrounding area we are getting their overflow. Last summer I had 65 students trying to get into a class.... If we take more students it doesn’t take rocket science to figure out that we will run out of the consumables needed to run the program. Trades Instructor
Capacity: Administration

My role is both what used to be the occupational dean as well as the associate vice president of instruction. I also have several economic and workforce development grants ... oversee tech prep ... handle curriculum approval work with the academic senate ... have both the schedule and the catalogue ... oversee VTEA. I also work with the (nursing) grant, ... work on the financial aid audit ... sit on a variety of committees, work with the district office economic development and leadership council. I have to admit that ... my ability to meet with business and industry in a workforce development capacity has been limited.  Dean
## Capacity: Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Programs*</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or no full-time faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 full-time faculty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These 56 programs represent occupational programs (including health programs) for which data were gathered regarding numbers of faculty.

---

We have 5 adjuncts that built a program. I hire and fire people. I do it because I love it and they enable me to do it, but if you do not have someone like me it won’t happen. I do it because I enjoy it and have resources otherwise. **Adjunct Faculty**
Capacity: Use of Funding Sources

- Using multiple sources – state, federal, private foundations, donations
- Blending, leveraging funds
- Grant writing capacity

“...having to make budget cuts, layoffs, cutting programs; innovations started through grants were not institutionalized ...”

Dean, Occupational Education
We are giving people an opportunity to get oriented to the field of biotech by providing them with basic skills courses to help them succeed in this area, some support services and a bit of career development orientation and training. **Chancellor**
Innovation & Flexibility

- taking risks on small enrollments
- incentives and revenue generation for programs
- support for program and curriculum development
- faculty and administrative professional development
- college wide discussions and commitments regarding basic skills, ESL and other concerns
- creating a culture of innovation and risk taking

I encourage all of my managers to make connections, network and be involved in at least 1 community organization. I also encourage them to try things. If we fail we learn from that and move on.

President
Diversity of Partnerships

City of Clovis

Bronze Triangle

Genentech

Sutter Health
Workforce Development Partnerships

Colleges find partnerships w/ WIB’s a challenge
- Representation on local WIBs
- Complexity of funding streams
- Multiplicity of WIBs in a given region
- Pressures to provide short term, time-limited training
- Political nature of the WIB process
- Difficulties with Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL)

Colleges find ETP a challenge
- One college reports “having it down”
- Payment issues paramount
Regional Planning & Cooperation

- ½ involved in large-scale, regional planning initiatives
- Multiple, overlapping regional entities that are not aligned nor mapped to one another.
  - Workforce investment boards
  - District and college service areas
  - Regional Consortia
  - Economic and Workforce Development regions
  - Economic Strategy Panel Regions
Alignment: System & State Resources

- Promote and market the work of the colleges
- Support and promote career ladders approach
- Streamline system processes
  - Curriculum & Program Approval
  - Tracking and Reporting
- Collaborate with State workforce agencies
- Simply and streamline funding streams
- State support for college role in WFD
Thank you

- Special Thanks to Los Medanos College
- Next report will be in November
- Contact information:
  Linda Collins
  1203 Preservation Park Way, Suite 201
  Oakland, CA 94612
  (510) 268-0566
  Lcollins@careerladdersproject.org
  www.careerladdersproject.org
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Appendix

- Ratings of Career Ladders Fit
- Ratings of Key Elements
# Ratings of Career Ladders Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College J</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Colleges</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratings of Key Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership w/ business, industry</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership w/others (CBOs, WIBs, labor, etc.)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cooperation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career pathways</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-based learning</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External curriculum integration</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal curriculum integration</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Student services</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>