

Adult Education

Co-Leads: Marie Mackintosh (DWD) and Rob Moore (Region 8)

Co-Lead: Marie Macintosh (DWD)	mmackintosh@dwd.in.gov
Co-Lead: Rob Moore (Region 8)	rmoore@mccsc.edu
Eugene Anderson EmployIndy	317-246-5412 ganderson@EmployIndy.org
Jodie Haidle (Springer) (R6)	jspringer@work-one.org
Kristina Blankenship (VR)	Kristina.blankenship@fssa.in.gov
Jeff Russell (VR)	Jeffery.russell@fssa.gov
Elaine Hubbard (R8)	ejhubbard@dwd.in.gov
Chris Cohee (R4)	ccohee@workonewestcentral.org

Responsibilities

- Ensure content standards for adult ed align with K-12 102 (b)(2)(D)(ii)(I)
- Identify curriculum standards to take into consideration meeting the performance indicators in Sec 116 223(a)((2)(I)
- Propose eligible provider criteria that take into account all the conditions outlined in 231(e)
- Determine impacts on WorkIndiana Policy
- Propose State Leadership Activities 223(a)
- Policy impacts on adult ed assessment
- Other issues as determined by the workgroup

Updates:

WIOA ADULT EDUCATION WORKGROUP

2.20.15

Meeting Minutes

Present: Rob Moore, alishea Hawkins, Marie Mackintosh, Trish Maxwell, Linda Warner, Dan Devers, Tom Miller, Marilyn Pitzulo, John Rutledge, Elaine Hubbard, Eugene Anderson, Chris Cohee

Absent: Nancy Davisson, Jeff Russell, Kristina Blankenship, Jodi Haidle

- 1) Welcome and introductions
- 2) WIOA overview for Adult Education
 - a. TEGL (Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) comes from US DOL) Overview – Came out Feb 19th
 - i. Will be emailed out
 - ii. Set DOL’s vision for WIOA
 - iii. Figuring out how the one stop system will work within the new WIOA framework-need to broaden our thoughts

1. DWD has to work with communities and other organizations to address these issues – this will be different for each region
 2. Where does the work of the WorkOne system fit in?
 - iv. Definite emphasis on serving individuals that have the most barriers to employment
 - v. Policies
 1. Integrated services – no wrong door
 2. WIB work on strategies
 3. Accountability and transparency
 4. Performance measurements will be over 2 years out
 - b. Making Skills Everybody's Business - A Call to Transform Adult Learning in the United States (Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE))
 - i. Studies showing the US is underachieving in skills
 - ii. Collective attention is needed to assist more people
 - iii. Create joint ownership of solutions in the community
 - iv. Ensure all students have access to highly effective teachers, leaders, and programs
 - v. Working with employers and finding a connection with AE students
 - c. WIOA and this group
 - i. How do we serve everyone
 - ii. How to open the door to others
 - iii. How do we work together; integrate AE in the one stop system
 - iv. How do we become change agents
- 3) WIOA Adult Education Workgroup
- 4) We are not a decision making body we are a recommendation making body
 - a. We are one workgroup out of 12
 - b. Three new activities for AE providers per WIOA
 - i. Workforce prep
 - ii. Integrated education and training
 - iii. Integrated English language learning and civic learning
 - c. Things we might review
 - i. Policies – need to get into place by July 1st
 - ii. Grant Application – Fall 2015 timeline for recommendations
 1. We have the opportunity to define this more clearly
 - iii. Structures
 1. Additional entities that can be providing services not
 2. Does the consortium work
 3. Assessments
 - iv. Performance Incentive Schedule
 - v. Promising Practices
 - vi. Three new activities (stated above) and State Leadership Activities (of those what we will focus on)
 1. Professional Development
 2. Technical Assistance
 - d. Action Steps
 - i. Our next meeting will be as a whole group to go over the Structure of AE and then to determine what, if any, small groups are needed
 - ii. March 6th 10-4:30
 - iii. Homework – ask individuals for feedback
 1. Guiding Questions – Marilyn and Alishea will come up with questions for the Adult Education Side

- a. What are the pros and cons of our existing consortium structure – lean on AEC’s
- b. Do we understand our measures and data – do we know where we are and do we know where we are going?
2. Presentation – establish the current the state of where we are currently and answers to the guiding questions
 - a. How do each of the regions look
 - b. How many fiscal agents are in the consortiums
 - c. Who is engaged in the consortiums (who is in present at the meetings)
 - d. How often do the consortiums meet
 - e. What is the focus of the meetings
 - f. What is the RO and WorkOne involvement
 - g. What is the referral process to service providers
 - h. Co-location of classes
 - i. WorkOne
 - ii. Colleges
 - iii. Jails
 - i. Promising/Best practices of the consortium
 - j. Not so great practices of the consortium
 - k. How are local businesses involved – does any consortiums have local employers at this time, as members
 - l. What are other states doing that have AE under Workforce Development
 - m. How do consortiums determine success
 - n. How might we integrate various populations like out-of-school youth

The highlights from March 6th Meeting:

- Workgroup collected feedback on current structure of Adult Education
- Workgroup discussed pros and cons of current structure
- Workgroup landed on a recommendation for DWD regarding structure of AE consortium, role of AEC and what guidance is needed from DWD
- Next meeting will be 4.17.15 with a focus on updating policies

WIOA Adult Education Workgroup

3/6/2015

Focus: AE Structure

Meeting Minutes

- 1) Introductions and Welcome
 - a. Reminder: The workgroup is not a decision making body but a group working together for recommendations for WIOA implementation
- 2) Overview of AE
 - a. History
 - i. Move AE from DOE to DWD – 2010: Developing framework for reform
 1. Eligible Training provider policy and reform in INTraning
 2. Customer flow policy
 3. EDSI WorkOne Trianings
 4. Development of WorkINdiana framework
 5. Procured statewide assessment s(TABE, ICE, WIN, etc.)
 6. Hiring of ACCs and AECs
 7. Aligned with IDOE to develop regional consortia and competitive grant competition framework
 - ii. 2011: Systematic Reform
 1. Legislation passed
 2. Developed new grant competition, policies, performace-based funding, tracking system, etc
 3. Communication to field about all of the changes
 4. Launch of WorkINdiana and GED+
 - iii. 2012: Focus on Process and Professional Development Priorities
 1. Sharing initial success of reform efforts
 2. Refining policies/processes and offering lots of TA
 3. Scaling WorkINdiana
 4. Survey of PD needs to determine PD plan
 5. Delivered array of PD events (summer institute, fall/spring teacher mtgs, InTERS trainings, TABE trainings, fall/spring director mtgs, etc)
 6. Development of websites to share information
 7. Building partnerships with OVAE, LINCS, CLASP, Ivy Tech, CHE, SWIC and WIBS, IAACE, etc.
 - iv. 2013: Strategic priorities
 1. New HSE test
 2. Standards based education focus with College and Career Readiness standards
 3. Focus on transition to college or career (via WorkINdiana, etc)
 4. Driving toward increasing enrollments (statewide outreach campaign)
 5. Continued PD events
 - v. 2014: Focusing on transitions
 1. Transitions-career pathways
 2. Increased enrollments
 3. Teacher competencies
 - vi. Future: Aligning policies, procedures, practices with WIOA
 - b. Data
 - i. from NRS Table 4
 1. PY 2011 outcomes (421 WorkIN enrollments)
 2. PY 2012 – growth across the board (646 WorkIN enrollments)
 3. PY 2013 – enrollments stagnant, but level gain growth (1089 WorkIN enrollments)
- 3) Review of where AE is now: Reviewed feedback from AE Directors, AEC's and others:
 - a. Number of Fiscal Agents

- i. Half have one fiscal agent others have all providers as fiscal agents
- b. Who is present at the consortium meetings
 - i. Sampling -AE director, WorkOne participation, RO participation, literacy groups, community college, library staff, community agencies
- c. Focus
 - i. Performance
 - ii. Professional Development Activities
 - iii. Discussion of shared customers/students
 - iv. Update on Works Council if present
- d. RO Involvement/WorkOne involvement
 - i. RO attends and WorkOne attends
 - ii. RO does not attend and WorkOne attends
 - iii. Both attend when able
 - iv. RO attends and WorkOne does not
- e. Referral Process
 - i. Overall not a set plan or a strong referral process
- f. Co-locations
 - i. Happens in lots of places, but not in all areas asked: WorkOne, Colleges, and Jails
- g. Services
 - i. HSE testing – High School Equivalency Testing
 - ii. ELL/ESL English Language Learners/English as a Second Language
 - iii. ASC – Adult Secondary Credit
 - iv. ABE – Adult Basic Education
 - v. WorkIN – providers who offer WorkIN training as a provider
- h. Promising practices
 - i. Streamlining processes - referrals
 - ii. Professional development to all consortium members not just ABE staff
 - 1. VR
 - 2. Literacy
 - 3. WorkOne Staff
 - iii. Regional Data
 - iv. Committees that meet prior to consortium meetings
 - v. Support from RO
 - vi. AE providers sharing resources
- i. Challenges to the consortium
 - i. Getting people to attend meetings
 - ii. A place for providers to vent their frustrations
 - iii. Can get caught up in negativity when it comes to policy frustrations
 - iv. Struggle to get partners to do more than attend the consortium meeting
- j. Success
 - i. Performance data – metrics, funding
 - ii. Not losing funding
 - iii. Partnerships allows brainstorming with each other
- k. Local Business Involvement
 - i. No businesses are involved
 - ii. Business Service Representative for WorkOne attends the meeting and contacts businesses for the consortium
 - iii. WIB – is the voice; do not want for them to be present
- l. Responses from AE Directors
 - i. Involvement – pro
 - ii. Mentoring – pro
 - iii. Meeting with a great group of people who understand – pro
 - iv. Consistency among the region – pro

- v. Holding each other accountable – pro and con
 - vi. Lack of involvement – con
 - vii. All programs are not given equal weight – con
 - viii. Sharing of grant money – con
 - ix. Disciplining less affective program – con that this can't be done
 - x. Lack of understanding roles – con
 - xi. Performance measures do not align well – con
- m. Regional Input (not already represented)
- i. Adult Ed individuals meet monthly and consortium meets quarterly – pro
 - ii. Use partnerships to gain enrollments and WorkIN providers – pro
 - iii. Agenda – everyone gets to have a role in the process – pro
 - iv. Roles – not understanding who has the teeth in the program – con
 - v. Responsibilities vs Authority - con
 - vi. Forced meeting; do we need to be a regional aspect - con
 - vii. People are defending their program instead of being supported - con
 - viii. Want to gain more work experiences and OJT's for students, because it isn't happening right now - con
 - ix. During a consortium meeting – personal agendas are being pushed - con
- 4) Now what do we do with this feedback
- a. Pros
 - i. Mentorship, Collaboration, “we” are not alone
 - ii. Safe place to speak about trials
 - iii. Consistency – monitoring, programs, students receiving same services
 - iv. Partnership and bringing together others
 - b. Cons
 - i. Bringing other agencies; being active
 - ii. Programs not being successful and bringing them up to the bar
- 5) Discussion
- a. Fiscal Agents
 - i. Whoever is a fiscal agent is, has to be an AE provider
 - ii. RO as a provider who contracts out
 - 1. Can hold individuals to the contract
 - iii. Multiple providers holding fiscal
 - 1. Schools are more encouraged to “stay in the game”
 - 2. Schools cannot service other areas within the region
 - iv. One fiscal agent per region
 - 1. Can move money around to other programs
 - 2. Fiscal agents see themselves only as holding the initial money not as a program manager
 - v. Objective Individual
 - 1. Without the history, they are not peers so they aren't “friend”
 - 2. Outside of a K-12
 - b. Thoughts
 - i. Are there bi-laws and do people follow it
 - ii. Could the state come up with a way to have procedure/structure for each consortium
 - iii. Establishing a stronger role of the AEC – are they accepted
 - iv. How do we support individuals to bring them up to succeeding
 - c. Recommendation
 - i. Consistency through bi-laws
 - 1. Language to say a minimum of standards but each region can develop and define what it means to them
 - 2. Certain minimum standards of performance
 - 3. How to address weak programs
 - 4. Strong language that each region has the ability to run their regions

- ii. Each program has to apply through the state – so the state holds the ability to say yes or no to a program – closer to a contract and less like a grant
 - 1. Make sure the grant process has both a regional component and an individual component
 - 2. Programs are awarded and giving incentives independently
 - iii. Policy at state level – procedure at a local level
 - iv. Required participants in consortium
 - v. Coordination between WIB and consortium
 - vi. One AEC per region
 - 1. Support partnerships within the region
- 6) RECOMMENDATION for AE structure:
- a. Create a consortia model; with modifications of increasing the role of the AEC...one AEC per region. DWD will set guidelines for consortia to be established, including bi-law and structure. DWD will set a core group of consortia members...including who are the leaders (should include the core members, WO, VR, AE).
- 7) Next mtg
- a. Assessment Policy
 - b. Performance Based Incentive and Professional Development - hold