

# Academic Senate

## Career Education Committee Meeting

October 14, 2025, 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. (Zoom Virtual Meeting)

<b>Voting Committee Members:</b>					
Regina Blasberg	<i>Business/CE Liaison/Committee Faculty Chair</i>	X	Justin Hunt	<i>Applied Technologies</i>	A
Harriet Happle	<i>Dean, Career Ed. Integrative Learning &amp; Employment Center /Administrator Chair</i>	X	Larry Alvarez	<i>Public Safety</i>	A
Bill Macpherson	<i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	A	<i>Shannon Doronio proxy for Mark Daybell</i>	<i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	X
Brittany Applen	<i>Humanities</i>	A	Nicole Faudree`	<i>COCFA Representative</i>	X
Hencelyn Chu	<i>Health Professions</i>	X	Regina Blasberg	<i>Applied Technologies</i>	X
Jaya George	<i>Health Professions</i>	X	SB Tucker	<i>Public Safety</i>	A
Jeff Baker	<i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	X	Siane Holland	<i>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (Adjunct)</i>	A
Jennifer Paris	<i>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</i>	X	Tim Baber	<i>Applied Technologies</i>	X
Jon Amador	<i>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</i>	A	Xanth Stack	<i>Applied Technologies</i>	X
Juanita Jaramillo	<i>Health Professions</i>	A			

<b>Other Members:</b>					
Dr. Thea Alvarado	<i>Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Instruction</i>	A	Monica Shukla-Belmontes	<i>Dean, Business &amp; Applied Technologies</i>	X
Marilyn Jimenez	<i>Administrative Assistant to the Academic Senate and Instructional Support</i>	X			

<b>Guest:</b>					
April Marin	<i>Classified Administrator, Exec Director, Contracts, Procurement, and Risk Management Services</i>	X	Hsiawen Hull	<i>Classified Administrator, Exec Director, Infrastructure and Information Security</i>	X
Dr. Daylene Mueschke	<i>Classified Administrator, VP, Institutional Research, Plan, &amp; Institutional Effectiveness</i>	X	Kimberly Night	<i>Full-Time Faculty, Auto</i>	X
Dr. Deanna Riveira	<i>Educational Administrator, Interim Dean, School of Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</i>	X	Lak Dhillon	<i>Full-Time Faculty, Faculty Director, Diagnostic Medical Sonography Program</i>	X
Dr. Jasmine Ruys	<i>Interim, Acting College President</i>	X	Scott McAfee	<i>Classified Staff, High Tech Ctr Access Coord III (IT)</i>	X
Jason Hinkle	<i>Classified Administrator, Interim Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Bus Services</i>	X	Tina Waller	<i>Full-Time Faculty, Director Nursing</i>	X
Jessica Crowley	<i>Full-Time Faculty, EMT</i>	X			

**Start Time:** 1:02 pm

**1) Approve Previous Minutes**

- a) September 22, 2025
  - a) Motion to approve minutes by Shannon Doronio, seconded by Nicole Faudree. Unanimous. Approved.
- 2) 1:05pm – 1:30pm Perkins Budget and Program Review - Daylene Meuschke and Jason Hinkle
  - a) **New Budgeting Tool:** The new budgeting tool was built in alignment with what is needed for Perkins' request.
  - b) **Challenges with the Budget:** There has been a perception of favoritism with some programs. It is important for all to understand that all programs have the opportunity for the same dialogue.
  - c) **TOP Codes:** There are 44 TOP codes with some spin-offs for a total of 50 programs that need are eligible for Perkins and SWP funds. These are to be funded with \$500K in Perkins funding.
  - d) **Perkins Funding:** There is a full-time administrative assistant being supported with this funding, Kathy Hernandez. 20% of the budget is allocated for professional development. In the end there is 300-350K for programs to cover memberships, specific department professional development relating to accreditation. There are software licenses which help to enhance the programs such as the Paralegal Program virtual law office.
  - e) **Digital Perkins Worksheets:** The Perkins worksheets were digitized and added to Program Review so all could fill out and understand program needs. This also needs to be outlined in terms of objectives for Perkins. There were some decisions made with incomplete information.
  - f) **SWP Funding:** There is SWP funding and administration needs to decide what is a forced cost, 777 and #999 requests. If the request does not occur in Program Review it is not a legitimate request.
  - g) **Program Review:** There is software needed for some revised curriculum and to be relevant with industry. The funding is lower, however, there are more requests. Faculty will start working on Program review by the end of the month and will be due in December. Harriet will begin working on Perkins budget in January and will work on SWP budget at the end of July. If there are instructional supply requests, SWP funds may be used. Perkins is looking at the last 3 years. The SWP application will no longer be performance based but a competitive based grant. There was a request to schedule a FLEX session to help chairs learn the digitized worksheets. Dr. Daylene Meuschke stated that she and Erika Torgeson, chair of the Program Review Committee, can return to a future CE committee to discuss the budget and the program review process.
  - h) **Supplies Definition:** There is a Budget & Accounting Manual given by the state that outlines the guidelines CCC's need to follow. For supplies faculty need to look at the use of life and if an item would be replaced, repaired or if it is a consumable. There are some items that need further review from the auditors. Supplies can go over \$200.00 if it meets the guidelines for a supply.

- i) **Fund 11 vs Perkins Funding:** There are concerns with ensuring faculty receive the funding they need. Fund 11 is district funding is for an ongoing departmental expenses. Perkins cannot be used for regular, ongoing program expenses.
  - j) **Perkins, SWP or Lottery Funding Sources:** It is important to look at the purchasing grant and categorical guidelines. So long as it fits the criteria those funds can be used. Every funding source has its own unique intricacies. In years when there has been funding left over there has been some back filing.
  - k) **Perkins Funding:** This funding is to be used for brand new programs or for those that need improvement. This funding revolves around technology to make sure skills training for workforce development is current. The past practice/rule has been to fund a program for 3 years using Perkins funding then institutionalize the program. There are many people who review the budgets to ensure there are no outliers that would cause a question from an auditor. Both the Perkins and SWP grant need to be approved by the monitor at the state.
  - l) **Budget Concerns:** There are some who feel there is a presupposition for certain programs to get funded. There has been much done to create a transparent process. In some areas due to inflation, programs' needs have gone up. Many times, historical trends are reviewed for possible increase in prices. Jason Hinkle looks at all requests and meets with the Dean to discuss.
  - m) **Program Quality Concerns due to increase prices:** There are concerns with program quality if a program needs to decide what should go and what items should stay. The suggestion is for faculty to document their request. The timing of the process is a challenge. You're using the previous year's data to project what is going to be spent in a future year.
  - n) **Existing Paper Budget Worksheets:** Harriet kept the worksheets and will share them in word version for faculty to use them for justification for specific items. The objectives in program review should be updated and are always required for funding requests.
- 3) 1:30pm – 2:00pm Valley Center Dr Property Discussion – Erin Tague and Jasmine Ruys
- a) There has been some discussion regarding moving the construction program to this area. This space was supposed to house the ATC. There have been questions about selling the property, however, the district cannot sell at this moment. It is now COC property and discussion needs to take place regarding how this property can add value to the district. It is important to bring in the Gensler group to discuss what the district needs. There was a 400-page Educational Facilities Master Plan that was composed but which didn't outline next steps. The ATC costs are being determined. This will impact the funding available for a Valley Center Drive project.
  - b) **Bond Funding:** There were 3 bonds available to help build, however, this is running out and there is a need to discuss how much is left over for each of the projects. When there are bond funds, 85% percent of the funds need to be spent within 3 years otherwise districts are faced with arbitrage. The district has been in discussion with the bond council and advisor. Last issue was for \$70M and now there is \$60M left. If the district continues with signing contracts this will go away quickly. The funds will not go away in three years, but the

district needs to show some consistent spending. There is concern that something will just be built too quickly.

- c) **New Shared Governance Model Proposals:** The consultant, Gensler, is working on helping the district with planning efforts. This will be reported through the shared governance model. This is not a project but more so planning and hiring a consultant to help with the project. This item may go to the Operations Teams that oversee the fiscal infrastructure. There will be a 10-year plan and there will be 3-year updates. The new participatory approach will allow for more input.
- d) **GE Funds:** The Valley Center Drive property was purchased with district funds. The district then transferred the cost to the GEO bond expense. As part of the GEO bond, the district cannot sell the property. The GEO bond is measure E and M, and building must align with the Measure E bond guidelines. For example, this must be a facility for CE education that falls in line with the demand of industry. The construction must occur within a 3–7-year window. There is the ability to spend \$3-4M dollars to build modulars there. The district will work with Gensler as part of the project (like the MESA Community College goals). It was suggested for CE committee members to review the [Mesa2030 Comprehensive Master Plan](#). For example when projects come through, they need to align with the district's goals. San Diego Mesa's 10-year plan is guided by its 5-year roadmaps [Roadmap to Mesa2030 | San Diego Mesa College](#). If this is an instructional facility, instruction is needed for feedback. There was a suggestion to invite a MESA college representative to discuss the change at their college.

**4) 2:00pm – 2:25pm Software Acquisition Processes Conversation - IT-Hsiawen, 508 - Scott McAfee, and Contracts – April Marin**

- a) **Preface:** Regina was contacted by many programs that use software programs to prepare students for industry. The idea is to discuss and have better clarity on the process for software purchasing.
- b) **Software Request:** These requests come in as a requisition, by telephone or in person. Other times the request comes through as an IT work order. All software requests are consolidated into one spreadsheet, and all stakeholders are copied.
- c) **Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) Requirements:** Hsiawen oversees the *Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT)* requirement that a vendor fills out to meet Section 508 and ADA compliance. April Marin oversees the contracts piece. All stakeholders review and approve and at times an executive cabinet member may need to provide input. There are 250 software applications running a year. The district is required to purchase accessible software. Scott will do a deep dive into the software to determine how accessible it is and make any recommendations. The VPAT is a questionnaire sent to the vendor for them to fill out. It determines the company's accessibility level.
- d) **Data Security:** Software is also reviewed for data security. This is to prevent data breaches. Need to ensure not just accessibility concerns are being addressed but security and risk areas as well.

- e) **GLBA Act:** This is a federal requirement for banks however, in 2019 the Student Aid Commission and the Institution of Higher Education received millions of dollars in funding that they distributed to community colleges. CCC's need to do a 3<sup>rd</sup> party assessment on vendors for risk. Hsiawen and April train other districts on how to prevent risks in doing business with these vendors.
- f) **Software Forms:** There may be some software platforms that are or can turn into a high risk if they collect confidential student information. The district needs to document who is using this particular software. There are requirements for the district regarding what to do with the data. Is there a way to streamline the CTE space for these products and if they are not intended to collect student data?
- g) **Inaccessible Software:** There may be fields where employers rely on specialized, industry-standard software that often does not meet full accessibility standards, not because they don't want it to, but because these tools are developed for professional industry use, not the education sector. Not all tools need to be accessible all the time. If a product does not currently meet accessibility guidelines but the software is necessary for students to learn in order to be employed, this can be documented, and it still may be possible to get the software. Many times, vendors can fix it. If a vendor cannot there are other options. In a worst-case scenario, a discussion can take place with an executive cabinet member to override and commit to researching products over the next few years. There are large organizations that spend much on products and they may not want to make them accessible. Need to encourage vendors to make software more accessible. There may be a student with certain disabilities that prevents them from doing what they need to do. What does this do for the students by accommodating if they may not be accommodated in industry?
- h) **Next Steps:** There was a suggestion to bring this back on a future agenda. It was also suggested to develop a step by step document of the process and review at the next meeting.
- i) Could FLEX session be scheduled on how to approach vendors? April is also hosting a Procurement Polozza on the software process. These are recorded and the links are provided. VPAT 2.5 is the current one being used but there is version 3 that will include an assessment of making virtual reality accessible.

5) Any topics we would like to address? – Everyone

---

### Parking Lot for Further Discussion

- Marketing Strategies
- CTE Curriculum Committee

### Future Agenda Items:

- Program Mapper – Clinton Slaughter
- Career Tree Updates Coming
- Competency Based Education Network (CBEN) presentation

- Advisory Board Handbook Update

### **2025/2026 CE Committee Meetings**

#### **Fall 2025:**

Tuesday, Oct 14: 1pm-2:30pm

Monday, Nov 10: 1pm – 2pm

Tuesday, Dec 2: 1pm – 2pm

#### **Spring 2026:**

#### **Adjournment:**