

WG4 Feedback on Career and Employer Engagement Technology Report

How did your perceptions change after reading the technology report?

After reading the report, my perception has changed for the better knowing that there is a single system that all employers can use and disperse their opportunities without having to register for each individual campus. This removes concern about "territorial" aspects when it comes to employment opportunities, especially for campuses that are within close proximity to one another.

None. I am extremely familiar with the software and the problems with it. I felt that WestEd is pushing the software and key items were omitted. I felt they were not the experts in working with software and meeting organizational needs.

All of this required tremendous labor and it's appreciated.

I'm not sure if I had any immediate perception changes after reading the report. I did feel like I had clarity on how they arrived at their proposals but still had questions regarding some of the scoring, percentages, and information shared/explored. I am also still a little unclear about the regions long-term plan after selecting and implementing a tool to help prepare the campus for long-range expectations, support needed, and training/development.

I felt a little confused. I don't think I will fully be able to envision how this will work at our college without actually being able to demo it. Is this meant to align to the new tracking metrics because it didn't seem like it would be able to capture any of the data that we are looking to start tracking. Is it expected that we will use an entirely different system outside of the CRM for tracking like SARS? I was hoping we would find a way to track throughout the region.

What lingering questions do you still have?

The report doesn't give specific timeline on when JobSpeaker would be implemented at each college, since this is something that the region is heavily investing in and would be a significant shift in campus database usage, when is the estimate that we would be asked to completely shift from CCN to JobSpeaker? Would there be campus/regional workshops for faculty to heavily promote the new system to have a large pool of candidates for employers to view?

Will HR departments use the system? This is a key element that WestEd omitted, even when brought to their attention.

What does the HR industry think about the system?

Will the "canned resumes" actually allow students to produce highly technical resumes so that they will be competitive with other job seekers? HR departments are going to take the best talent and I had confirmed the resume produced by JobSpeaker would not get the student an interview.

Why does the student resume have to be in "canned" sections that is produced in PDF Why can't the system produce a resume in Word, and then the student can easily edit it?

Will the student still be able to log into the system when they leave college?

At what point will their data be deleted?

Why are we not using the free software that is available to all of the Cal. Com. Colleges that was just made available?

How will Jobspeaker make it possible to leave contact notes when working with students?

How will this software merge with existing college software, such as STARFISH and Hubspot?

What are the costs of each system to maintain?

How will the contract for the software read when we need a change?

how will we eliminate the need for costly consultants? At what point should they exit?

Have ALL CTE Deans agreed to using these methods and commit these collaborative efforts? Will employers actually use the messaging feature on job board? Will all the employers who registered on CCN need to re-register on the new job board OR can we do this internally?

Bakersfield and Cerritos College use Jobspeaker for student employment, not for WBL activities (PG 8). It would be important to hear from campuses that are using the platform with similar interest and capability needs as our region. How many campuses have implemented Jobspeaker? Were conversations had with any campuses that have expressed negative experiences and/or broken contracts with them?

2.1.1 Tool Selection Research - CCN (PG 13) - Why wasn't a review of CCN completed by one of the 6 region campuses that use the platform in order to include it in the re-assessment? It appears from the report language that 1 person at CCN was contacted. Were attempts to contact other contacts at CCN made?

Regional Coordination Testing (PG 27) - How many employers were involved in this testing process?

Deans/Associate Deans Buy-In (PG 33) - What about getting buy-in and approval from Career Center staff and faculty? What about buy-in from campus Pathway Navigation and/or Guided Pathways workgroups? What is the threshold to determine if sufficient buy-in is earned from the region and all stakeholders prior to purchasing a technology platform?

3.3.1 Identify Implementation Teams and Coordinators (PG 44) - Who will form this team? Who is recommended to be a part of this team? Will they receive additional pay for this work?

Jobspeaker scored 100 points, yet the report highlights several features that have limited or no functionality and that there is a list of additional features that Jobspeaker still has to implement. Does this score imply that the current product meets every need for the region?

Gradleaders and Purple Briefcase scored 98 points. What was the determination between these 2 platforms and Jobspeaker? How was it decided that only 1 platform would be recommended rather than an option of the top 3?

What hands-on experience did the researcher participate in with each of the platforms? Will campus practitioners (WBLC, JPCM, Deans, Career Center staff, etc.) have the ability to test out a live demo before a decision is made?

Q1: In regards to CCN I noticed that 6 of the identified campuses currently use this function. I understand a connection could not be fostered in-time for the report but I wonder if any of the campuses utilizing the tool were questioned and if the tools utilized are worth exploring as it is already a vetted system.

Q2: The scoring of 100 points for JobSpeaker versus PurpleBriefcase received a score of 98. Yet there were several areas of the proposal that mentioned limited functionality, processes that are not rolled out, or upgraded features. Is the assumption that the region would adopt the tool at full capacity or would independently be responsible for customizing the campus needs? Additionally, this seems like a very small margin and I am wondering if we will have more access to the tool exploration process and have more time to discuss which tool is the best fit for all campuses.

Q3: On page 33 you spoke about Dean Buy-In I am wondering if before we select a tool/advance will the information be vetted through the campuses and partners (the report spoke about meeting with recruiters but was limited information as well). What is the criteria and approval from Deans and campus community since these will be many of the practitioners approving and having more access to the tool?

Q4: As the new funding policy, chancellor's office outlined many changes are happening to SWF and policies criterium and funding. Knowing that some of this data was gathered 2 years ago and the needs of the practitioners, faculty and JPC/WBL have changed what assessment has taken place in regards to the new mandates when utilizing the prior rubric when selecting a tool?

Q6: A lot of the testimonials speak to the tool being unclear on how to do aspects like identifying degrees, uploading ed-plans and destinations/clarity for students. Yet the report mentions that the tools are "straight forward" with the development of the API. Were these functionalities utilized through the inquiry phase, if so by whom is there any feedback in regard to the clarity issues and what we would be able to do to keep students in mind when utilizing the tool?

As we know, many of our students complete courses at multiple colleges throughout the region. As we work with the new metrics to track by student rather than by activity, is there a way for us to upload all of our students into any of these systems? Could we have these students show input which courses they are enrolled in so that when we complete WBL activities for a whole class the system will show that all those students have completed the activity and will show if students are enrolled in other colleges and the activities they are completing there as well? It doesn't seem that these technologies are aligning to these new metrics? Would students have to go in and create an account in order for us to track them? Would they have to have a different account for each campus or could they list that they are enrolled in multiple and we would see that on our end?

| What other information do you need? |
|---|
| <p>Will each campus IT department be trained on the functions of JobSpeaker or would it fall on the Career Center/JPCM/WBLC staff to troubleshoot any immediate issues for students and/or faculty? Would there be an opportunity to provide feedback on changing the student user face to create a more user friendly launch pad?</p> |
| <p>None.</p> |
| <p>When will we actually start using the job board and will all colleges start at the same time? Will we all be using Handshake? Will there be streamlined marketing for students and employers?</p> |
| <p>Who was spoken to, how did interviews take place (phone, in-person, etc.), and what questions were asked of each career engagement tool?</p> <p>Where are the rubrics to show how scoring was completed for career engagement tools (ie: point breakdown)? How were points determined?</p> <p>What will be the cost for implementation and maintenance of the Jobspeaker platform? Are there any additional fees associated with the additional features that have yet to be created, but were included as components within the assessment?</p> <p>What will be the campus costs?</p> |
| <p>Q1: I noticed the report didn't outline how the product reviews were conducted (focus groups, campuses, the sales team from the company) can this information be released to see who was involved, their usage level with the programs and etc?</p> <p>Q2: The report is not clear about hosting events. Currently, CCN has an on-campus recruitment module, events live manger (with the ability to take payment) and additional functionalities that do not appear to be present with JobSpeaker. What tool would be used to remedy this critical aspect?</p> <p>Q3: How involved were Career Center staff and practitioners as they would be heavily involved at the campus level in implementing the tools there is limited information in the report?</p> |
| <p>Which WBL activities are currently being tracked and how are they being coded? Are we deciding on these codes by college? Or by region? Are we getting buy in from those of us doing the work on the ground level? Would we be able to actually use and demo the technology so we can give our feedback? This report doesn't seem to be super transparent in regards to negative feedback. I would have appreciated more straight forward remarks as to what the limitations actually are. Jobspeaker seemed to have scored very high considering all of the limitations listed. How were the points calculated?</p> |

What are the strengths of the proposed technologies?

Really is the API to allow both technologies to talk to one another so that we are not duplicating information. The API helps in ensuring that, as long as there is a process in place that is being followed, employer information is not being submitted more than once and that an employer is not being reached out to multiple times.

It will pull in jobs from all employers. It allows businesses to post jobs and push them out. However, 75% of all jobs are found through networking. Thus, using this software really is not needed. I would argue we should use a central CRM system that works with students and keeps the business contacts.

The Statement of Need was extremely clear. The tool will enable colleges to capture employment-related Student Success metrics

There are a lot of features that show positive capabilities. I'm hopeful that the region and practitioners will be given the opportunity to have live practice with the top selected platforms to compare usability.

I appreciated the rubrics, information shared, and overall report it was a thoughtful process with many moving parts.

Without being able to demo the technology ourselves to know if it does what we need it to do I can't say I know what the strengths are. Having a region-wide system seems like a great idea for tracking our students but I'm not sure that is found in these options.

Where do you see gaps in the proposal?

While the proposal states that the region does plan to adopt this, there is concern that not all campuses will adopt a unified database in order to fully implement this idea of collaboration. While this would not hinder the work done at one individual campus, this still creates a semi-autonomous aspect for any campus that does not adopt the new system that can leave the door open to operating away from the regional collaboration.

The software is not matched to function in community college students and job placement. Having a HubSpot CRM is a workaround. Why not look at only having a CRM like Sales force or Hubspot. Gap between the system and HR profession, no data to support they will use it. Experience is HR recruiters, etc. are not going to use or look into special systems when they already have their own applicant tracking systems that push out jobs.

Interested in learning more about the mobile application for messaging and having students report their job application progress. JPCMs will still have difficulty tracking if students and employers aren't utilizing the tools. Therefore, a lot of job placement data will slip through the cracks.

Career Services/Events Management (PG 14)

The following statement was made within the report. Mesa informed the researchers that they attempted to use the events management feature in Jobspeaker, but its functionality did not allow for electronic payment, refund options, and payment by check as required by SDCCD Business Services. This information was also left on page 21 when a further explanation of assessment of tools was described.

Tools are straightforward and appear to meet needs. Mesa, Miramar, and Palomar

WBL Process Management (PG 14)

As noted on page 10 and further explained on page 20, Mesa College focused on evaluating and making recommendations for the online workflow for Work-Based Learning opportunities and participation. However, Mesa's findings and feedback were left out of Table 1 which provides a summary of assessment of Jobspeaker features tested within the pilot.

Process management tools are helpful but there needs to be more differentiation and clarity around the multiple types of WBL activities that can be managed. (Miramar and Palomar)

2.2.1 Jobspeaker Pilot Findings (PG 16-17, 25)

It appears that mostly positive testimonials were included in the report. Were no negative comments given?

Faculty and Student Workshops (PG 23):

While data is listed within this section, the reader has to read and cull through it themselves. The following data was included, but not highlighted in this section from Mesa College faculty:

50% of faculty disagree that students will be able to easily navigate the technology platform and use its features.

27% of faculty disagree and an additional 27% of faculty are neutral (54% total) that the technology platform provides information about workplace experiences for students.

25% of faculty disagree and an additional 42% of faculty are neutral (67% total) that the technology platform makes it clear to students how each feature is helpful for career readiness.

Colleges' Impressions of the Vendor (PG 28) - This section does not address the hold that campuses and the regional pilot experienced due to lack of communication with Jobspeaker and their ability to make requested updates. There were several meetings in which discussion surrounded stalled activities leading to an extension of the pilot timeline.

Were there any blindspots regarding the tools in particular Jobspeaker?

Were there any information interviews conducted with Workforce Partnership that hosts the business collaboratively and has an existing tool in place?

It seems that the report is very positive but also continued to mention "recommendations submitted" - were these things actually fixed by the programs to meet the needs? Were the colleges happy with the edits?

On page 21 – “The inclusion of WBL opportunities on the job board is valuable when a student needs to search and apply for an internship like they would a job. When the opportunities are less formal but still need to get tracked (e.g., an information interview), it was less clear to students where they would track this in Jobspeaker.”

Would we be relying on students to go into this tool and track their own WBL activities? I imagined the tracking happening on our end – not being the responsibility of the student. How can we expect any accuracy in this data if it is dependent on if the student goes into this site in their own free time to enter in the information. How can we override?