**K-12 & Mt. SAC Regional Consortium**

**Meeting Agenda**

Wednesday, May 28, 2014

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Mt. SAC Building 40, Room 103

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X | Baldwin Park | X | Charter Oak | X | Mt. San Antonio | X | Walnut Valley |
| X | Bassett | X | Covina Valley | X | Pomona | Partners present:  Priyadarshini Chaplot | |
|  | Bonita |  | Hacienda La Puente | X | Rowland |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Items** | **Outcomes** |
| Welcome & Agenda Check | Reviewed minutes, one edit to change “agendas” to “minutes.”  Madelyn Arballo (Mt. SAC) moved and Enrique Medina (Pomona) seconded the motion.  Announcements   * Subcontract Agreement – Please e-mail to Donna so she can release the P.O. number for your district expenses. * Use the spreadsheet in our shared drive to record mileage (use your own rate) and submit expenses. Submit the invoice with back-up to Donna on a monthly basis. |
| Announcements   * Priya’s transition * Next steps | Identified skill set for the next Project Facilitator:   * Facilitation experience * Manage conversations * Possibly be familiar with tools for collaboration * Does not necessarily have to be a writer   Possibilities:   * Donna can follow up with Neil Kelley * Priya can follow up with June Bayha at WestEd * Julie can follow up with Wanda Pyle, Ken Pyle * Jeanine can follow up with Nancy Moore   If we need a writer, Donna/Madelyn suggested Omi Sloan from Mt. SAC who is a strong writer (including research writing) and just wrote the narrative for the ABE/ASE program area. Madelyn will follow up with Omi.  The committee was excited about Wanda Pyle as the Project Facilitator because of her extensive background in adult education and grant writing as well as her current retirement status. Julie would follow up with Wanda. |
| First drafts from task groups   * Approach to providing feedback * Timeline | A couple of the program area co-chairs have noted that certain districts have not been attending the meetings or contributing to the drafts. The future protocol is having the program chairs directly contact the district point person/steering committee member(s) so they can address the issue with the appointed task members from their district. Immediately addressing the issue will help our efficiency.  Priya will upload the steering committee contact information as well as attendance sheets (that the program chairs can fill out for their respective meetings) into the shared Google Drive. Priya will also create a folder called “Drafts of Objectives 1, 2, 4” that will hold all the current materials – drafts, data tables, list of partners.  Data tables are being populated but information is still missing. The steering committee has agreed to enter the data into the spreadsheet by June 16, so that both feedback to the drafts as well as the revised data tables will be provided to the program area task groups at the same time.  Revised timeline:  By Monday, June 2 – Priya shares drafts with committee  By Thursday, June 12 – Committee reviews and provides feedback on the drafts (directly in Google Drive)  Thursday, June 12 – Steering Committee meeting is dedicated to reviewing and organizing feedback on the drafts  By Monday, June 16 – Steering Committee provides feedback on the drafts  By Thursday, July 10 – Program areas submit narratives for Objectives 1, 2, 4  By Thursday, July 24 – Our writer integrates the five drafts into a single working narrative  By Monday, July 28 – Steering Committee provides any final feedback  By Wednesday, July 30 – Our write integrates any final feedback and the narrative is sent to the state workgroup  For this first phase, the drafts will be shared in Google Docs. Steering Committee members can directly provide feedback in the documents.  Priya will also share this information with the program area co-chairs, letting them know the revised timeline and to suggest that they use this time to engage with partners, think about translating outlines into narratives. |
| Partners   * What does their engagement look like? * How should it be structured? | There are some partners who are specific to the program areas and other partners that cut across multiple program areas. The steering committee agreed to empowering program areas to reach out to their own partners. The committee suggested to the co-chairs to inform the partners that their engagement is in an advisory capacity, that they do not have to attend task group meetings, that they will not be receiving funding through this project, but that their insights and experiences will help inform how we can collaborate regionally for the benefit of all of our shared students.  The Steering Committee also agreed that there could be a set of partners serving in an advisory capacity to the Steering Committee itself. For example, the partners could help review the narrative and provide feedback. |
| Other Items | Donna mentioned an update from the state workgroup that there may be a requirement for a faculty sign-off on the plan. Steering committee members voiced concerns (e.g., aren’t they already signing off since we have faculty representation in our task groups?). Donna will share the concerns with the workgroup and possibly hold a conference call between committee members and state workgroup members to address related issues. |

**Future meetings: Steering Committee meeting on Thursday, June 12 from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. (2nd Thursday of each month).**