

Technology Report Questions & Comments

Section 1. Executive Summary

- Regarding Hubspot, access to the system for the Career Center/Employment Services Team at each college would be key to making sure it is adopted and used on a wider scale. **Would there be an opportunity to try it out in order to see its capabilities? Page 6**

Section 2. Research into Career and Employer Engagement Tools

- From the Jobspeaker Pilot Findings – will the “issues” identified in this section be resolved/addressed before implementation? For example, the ability to select a FT or PT job for a cooperative education experience. (page 20)
- How will the mentors be vetted? (page 22)
- A number of students’ comments were regarding the need for/better tutorial. Will this be created prior to implementation? (page 25)
- Course-Based Skills Feature section – how often will the skills-based matching feature be updated? (page 25/26)
- Another concern is how the requests show the need for students to enter all of their coursework in their profiles. This seems like another reason for the student to not want to utilize this job board. They do not like having to spend so much time creating their profiles and this would just increase the amount of time. Page 26
- How are courses transferred into the college incorporated into the student’s skill bank? (page 26)
- Were research activities done with employers? Page 27-28
- What about issues related to FERPA and us sharing students’ information regionally? (page 28)
- Some of our concerns are regarding student privacy. Currently, we do not allow recruiters to have access to our student profiles. Students have expressed concerns on this topic and we reassure them our current tool is not set up that way. **Is there a way to turn that feature off of for our school in particular?**
- Summary of Recommended Product Enhancements section – Does Jobspeaker have the capacity to handle all 10 institutions at the same time? (page 30/33/34) From experience with the website project, the management and support to 10 institutions with 10 different cultures, processes, etc. is an overwhelming task.
- Page 32 discusses faculty engagement. Classroom faculty are key players in the implementation of these recommendations and their buy-in is needed as they are the direct link to students. Are there recommendations on how to strategically approach the faculty in the region as a whole to have this discussion beyond the regular updates in communication plans as noted on page 33?
- Page 33 discusses Deans and IT buy-in. The discussion with campus and, in some cases, District Deans and IT departments is critical. Multi-campus districts have an additional layer of consultation and coordination that needs to occur. This will again need to take a regional strategic approach. Curriculum deans, IT directors, Webmasters, Public Information Officers all need to be at the table.

- A large group that also needs to be consulted are the career centers, their counselors and respective managers. While some career center personnel are involved with the current regional work, others are not. The region will be changing their practices and tools, so their buy-in is critical.
- Page 36: What consideration was given to using CCN and the SDWP Launchpad tool?
- Under Regional-Level Principles, what is the asterisk referencing on #5, Page 40?

Section 3. Implementation Recommendations

- Page 44 indicates a recommendation for an RFA to fund a dedicated implementation coordinator at each college. Regarding this position:
 - Is it a permanent position or only for implementation? The technology of this scale requires an ongoing dedicated staff member. One of the factors that have inhibited colleges from fully utilizing the CCN tool, is the lack of a dedicated person to manage the daily needs of the system, provide training, technical assistance, and implementing newly added features. It would be critical to have this as a permanently funded position.
 - For multi-college Districts with separate IT departments from the campus, it may be necessary to have additionally funded positions to assist with the multi-level approval and implementation landscapes.
- If we decide to move forward with the implementation, how are we going to share this recommendation with presidents/VPs to ensure regional buy-in and smooth implementation? Including how to address colleges/districts that do not want to implement due to internal technology limitations? Section 3.3.2, Page 45
- Section 3.3.3, Page 45: What consideration is given to including the deans, classroom faculty, and the implementation coordinators in the roll out? And who is #2 Work-Based Learning faculty referring to since Work-based Learning Coordinators are already listed? Regular classroom faculty? Work Experience faculty?
- Page 46 Section 3.3.4 Establish a Governance Process, Job Speaker: To implement the enormity of this undertaking, it would be beneficial for Job Speaker to have a dedicated technician for all the Regional work. This would enable timelines to be met.
- Finally, we are concerned that moving away from our current tool and switching to Jobspeaker might be a step backwards for our college specifically. We have been implementing our current tool since 2017. To this day, we are still customizing the profiles as we learn additional information on student and employer needs as well as reporting needs. We have learned that many things that seemed possible at the time, are no longer an option. Appendix F states some fairly standard features that are not implemented in Jobspeaker; there seems to be a lot of “in progress” steps. It doesn’t seem prudent for us to implement a system that doesn’t do what we need it to do at the time of implementation. ***It would be ideal to review Jobspeaker once the features have all been designed and implemented so that we don’t have false expectations.***
Page 48 Section 3.4.2
- Page 49 3.4.3 Lay Foundation for Regional and College-Level Implementation: Process Recommendation that informs Roles and Responsibilities, Second bullet – regarding the RD determining if an employer is ready to engage. What about employers that do not have a sector RD? What about jobs for non-CTE students?
- My biggest concern is the technology piece and having our IT departments in on the conversation with implementing and supporting Job Speaker platform. Page 53

- Can data from existing tools be easily transferred to Jobspeaker? Page 54
- Page 51 Employers: This section assumes that employers have the time and what to be utilizing a system at this depth. Do we have feedback from employers that they want/need this?
- Page 52 Students and Alumni: Some colleges may need the buy-in of their Alumni Coordinators for these functions.
- Page 52 Conduct Implementation Readiness Assessments for Each College: This section needs to take into consideration multi-college districts and the resulting additional time and involvement due to their organizational structures.
- Can Jobspeaker be linked to Canvas and Portfolium? (Does Portfolium do the same thing as Jobspeaker?) Page 54
- Page 55 K12 Pathway Mapping and Career Exploration: This section needs to take into consideration the campus and/or district employees responsible for K-12 partnerships and CCAP programs.

Appendices

- ***Does the system provide an easy way to separate and effectively manage processes for students who are seeking employment on campus or who are interested in and are reporting internships? Appendix D Page 6***
- We wouldn't want to sacrifice functional processes due to limitations of implementing a system across all the colleges. We wouldn't want a tool that students do not use because they are required to wade through many things that do not pertain to them. As an example our on-campus/work study jobs are posted on our tool. Students apply for and report hiring for on-campus student worker positions. ***If we used Jobspeaker, would on-campus jobs be visible to other schools?*** That would be confusing for students. Supervisors will be discouraged if they begin receiving resumes and applications from other colleges' students. These same concerns would apply to WBL activities and events that are specific to each campus. Appendix D Page 6
- Similarly, ***is there a "gate" or some other system which only allows qualified students (those who have completed our three critical activities – resume, etc.) to apply for internships and on-campus jobs?*** This is important for meeting the expectation of employers. Appendix D Page 6
- ***What will it look like for each school, will there be robust capabilities to search geographically (a driver for many of our students)? Appendix D Page 6***
- The report does a good job of outlining the benefits to regional employers to simplify their process of seeking candidates. The unknowns are how well it would serve the needs of students at our individual colleges. ***Would the tool make our internship and employment placement teams more effective in doing their jobs?*** That is a big question that we feel the report does not answer. Appendix D Page 6
- A limitation of our current system is the "snapshot in time" which requires ongoing downloads and difficult tracking of student progress. ***Does Jobspeaker allow for real time updates and robust case management milestones that can be built in and make us more effective in our follow-up?*** Appendix D Page 6
- In Appendix F there are a number of items that are important to the implementation that are still undeveloped. When we were implementing our current tool, it took us nearly a year to iron out the profile criteria. That is still a dynamic process for our small team. If changes or modifications are to be made through a regional governance process, as outlined in the report, it would impede our ability to be nimble and try new things. ***How would we ensure that the system stays flexible and responsive to the emerging needs?***