



Consortium and Member Effectiveness Team

Tuesday March 6, 2018

SUMMARY

On March 6, 2018, the AEBG Field Team process started with a meeting at the Sacramento County Office of Education. The Consortium and Member Effectiveness and Evaluation Team (CME2) met in small-group to achieve these outcomes:

- Getting to Know One Another
- Clarification of Our Charge
- Discussion of opportunities and challenges
- Clarify roles, schedule and other organizational issues

Team Members

Andrew Carter

Blaine Smith

Daniel Soriano

Debbie Vanschoelandt

Holly Correa

Kathy Garcia

Kit Alvarez

Kiu Chuong

Paoling Guo

Stacy Nojima

Steve Bsharah

Steve Thompson

Facilitation Team

Paul Downs

Neil Kelly

Greg Hill

Sudie Whalen

TOPIC	RESULTS	DISCUSSION
<p>Draft Charge</p> <p>The team reviewed the following draft charge points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Define characteristics, activities, and metrics related to consortium effectiveness and member effectiveness. ▪ Develop a plan to increase consortia and member capacity to use effectiveness activities/measures in planning and evaluation ▪ Define the interplay between member effectiveness recommendations and activities for the 3-year plan 	<p>Refined Charge</p> <p>The group identified the following refined charge during the session:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Identify best practices and metrics to support data-informed locally responsive continuous improvement.”</p> <p>Here is a cleaned up version proposed by the facilitator after the meeting:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“Identify best practices and metrics each local consortium can use to improve their performance.”</p> <p>Key Principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There needs to be effective engagement of state leaders to accelerate consortium and member effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Articulate a vision for AEBG ▪ “Raise the bar” – Elevate the statewide expectations for effectiveness ▪ Highlight best practices ▪ Engage legislators and K12 leaders to understand adult ed role and impacts and support adult ed success 	<p>Below are the detailed comments made by the team members during the charge discussion:</p> <p>There is a significant need to be outcome and enrollment focused based on clear guidelines and directions this team develops.</p> <p>Team agrees they do not want to only state “this is what effectiveness is” but they want to help people along and help them actually achieve effectiveness.</p> <p>Recommend ways to support increasing capacity and effectiveness</p> <p>Use the mechanisms already in place to help consortia become effective and look at how they are evaluating or managing fiscal data, this will avoid duplication of effort and wasting resources</p> <p>There should be something all consortia can inspect (standards, education codes, etc.) and everything should be clearly defined and streamlined for clarity and ease of access</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity at the state level between the two state agencies, that needs to improve</p> <p>The focus should not only be based on effectiveness arbitrarily but should also focus on compliance so that this becomes part of how all of this comes together to meet the needs of students and remain compliant</p> <p>Part of the issue with compliance could be the struggle with clear articulation on what hiring requirements are and assuring all consortia members understand said requirements.</p> <p>CTE credentialing is an important issue for the state to address and cross-walking ESL and basic skills as well</p> <p>There should be more focus on professional development and the artificial barriers in each district (such as what education code was before AB104 and what has changed and no longer applies “policy</p>

TOPIC	RESULTS	DISCUSSION
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Ensure local flexibility 3. Recognize stages of development and performance – not all members and consortia are at the same level 4. Emphasize self rating of standards by members and consortia to support continuous improvement 	<p>versus lore”)</p> <p>Some like the local control funding formula (LCFF) with a set of statewide guidelines and a local process to develop the LCAP</p> <p>We have the same target areas that are also part of WIOA and we also should abide to that</p> <p>When effectiveness is mentioned it’s ultimately also talking about education code, but we need to determine if we’re also talking about governance – fiscal management is part of the three-year plan</p>
<p>Draft Team Methodology</p> <p>The facilitator proposed using “Student Progress Framework” (see page 7) to define metrics and associated activities/core functions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connection ▪ Entry ▪ Progress ▪ Completion <p>The team discussed two steps that the Consortium and Member Effectiveness and Evaluation Team would take:</p> <p>Step 1: Refine the activities to improve the list (clarify, fill gaps, etc.)</p> <p>Step 2: For each activity, define two measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outcome: How would we know if consortium/member were 	<p>Refined Methodology</p> <p>The facilitator proposed adding “capacity” to create an overall member effectiveness framework based on the Student Progress Framework. The goal of adding capacity is to create a more complete and systemic framework that includes the capacity of each member and consortia to implement and manage the student progress elements. For example, member and consortia need adequate management capacity.</p> <p>The group agreed to drafting material related to capacity. The revised framework is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity ▪ Connection ▪ Entry ▪ Progress ▪ Completion 	<p>The existing framework does not include everything the consortia cares about.</p> <p>There should be a standard regarding needs assessment, there also needs to be a standard for administrative capacity based on need. There used to be education code for administrative capacity.</p> <p>The team can includes language to encourage consortia to build on existing needs assessments, for example, those conducted by community colleges and by partner agencies and groups.</p> <p>The framework should also include consequences and how to measure effectiveness</p> <p>One of the strongest forms of accountability is peer accountability – it helps to bundle accountability with leadership, data accountability, and learning and growth. It also helps to add transparency to that to avoid mismanagement.</p> <p>The activities in the Student Progress Framework could be refined so that it is more accurate and reflects the areas of concern which have been raised. For example – expanding marketing and outreach and looking at how to measure that (e.g. enrollment numbers in target groups). Additionally, the process measure should also be included – this process measure would be qualitative.</p>

TOPIC	RESULTS	DISCUSSION
<p>being effective in that activity (core function)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Process: What would the consortium/member need to accomplish to implement the activity 	<p>Key Points</p> <p>There needs to be a strong focus on the key outcomes and legislators care about.</p> <p>There is a strong interest in accountability but accountability does not equate to effectiveness.</p> <p>The team’s emphasis is more to support improvements than to impose consequences.</p> <p>The “activities” in the Student Progress Framework are better thought of as “core functions”</p> <p>The team will take into account existing effectiveness tools and policies.</p>	<p>Equity within consortiums should also be included regardless of agency size (agencies vary within the consortium regarding size and scope) – there should be an indicator of equity within each consortium - A base-funding formula could be used to accomplish this</p> <p>State requirements should also be included with member effectiveness including data information that includes accountability that is the same across the state from the various consortia</p> <p>Accountability/compliance does not necessarily equate to effectiveness – we want to be outcome focused (e.g. consortiums enroll less to influence better outcomes and then fewer students are served)</p> <p>Consortiums need realistic goals</p> <p>This was also an issue with the three-year plan, there were no consequences when goals weren’t met</p> <p>There needs to be outcome focused, we want to go above and beyond what’s already in place. If the outcome metric is the number served – this team would be to determine the best practices to develop a data informed plan. This requires having an outcome metric and have a process indicator that is also a learning tool.</p> <p>One must first define the activities and then determine best practices thus cultivating and curating shared strategies to rise above the bare-minimum requirements.</p> <p>This is inclusive of locally defined effectiveness measures</p> <p>The focus could be on incentives and not necessarily consequences</p> <p>There should be a connection between effectiveness and funding at least on a local level and this is somewhat supported by education code. However – there is no direct link between effectiveness and funding in state or federal law.</p> <p>This team will not, at this point, connect funding to effectiveness, a</p>

TOPIC	RESULTS	DISCUSSION
		<p>recommendation could be made in the future, but, at this time these topics will remain separate.</p> <p>Data informed decisions to inform the process will assist in making improvements.</p> <p>There is a connection between the consortium and consortium members' effectiveness – the team will henceforth be referred to as the consortium and member effectiveness team.</p> <p>There should be a self-assessment to determine if the consortium/member is effective. Some assessments could be very simple and easy to address while others can be more challenging (i.e. a development scale).</p> <p>One concern is if we put the updated activities out there and the data doesn't fit into the activity scale developed. Legislators do not want to hear about activities they want to hear about outcomes. Whatever we do needs to be outcomes based – jobs/employment are healthy definitions of success (but not the only definitions).</p> <p>One can think of the activities as core functions – outcome metrics needs to be defined such as outreach to target/special populations. For each activity (core function) there should also be an outcome metrics and the activity should be tied to a need.</p>
<p>Team Membership</p> <p>The current team is diverse in terms of geography and size of the represented consortia.</p>	<p>Proposed Changes</p> <p>The group discussed engaging outside perspectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community-based organizations ▪ Business/industry partners ▪ Public agency representatives <p>The group said it was better to engage outside groups when ready to address specific areas they would care about, e.g., effectiveness measures related to</p>	<p>Members volunteered to ask potential members to join.</p>

TOPIC	RESULTS	DISCUSSION
	employers or partners. Important to get organized and have clarity before inviting new people.	
Team Meeting Schedule and Topics	<p>Quarterly “all-team” meetings will be face-to-face.</p> <p>We can set virtual meetings in the interim</p> <p>A few meetings should occur before bringing in any new members</p>	<p><u>Next Meetings</u></p> <p><i>Monday, April 16th</i> 1:30 – 3:00 web-conference (details TBD).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refine strategies/activities and begin defining outcomes metrics (see green area of the framework – this is the starting point of the refinement) • TOPICS: Capacity and Connection/Entry <p><i>May 17th</i> 1:30 – 3:00 modality to be determined. TOPIC: Progress</p> <p><i>Next quarterly meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion
Next Steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request a white paper to map and assess existing effectiveness frameworks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CCAE/CAEAA AE framework for 18/19 (five target areas) this has been pushed to the legislative analyst’s office (LAO) ▪ Noncredit CC also has a framework with LAO ▪ ACCE ▪ Other states 2. Set up a hub (e.g. Google Drive) to share resources 3. Compile background materials to support the work (i.e., metrics, best practices, core functions, etc.) 	

Attachment: AEBG Student Progress Framework

The Framework was developed to provide a structure for the work of the field teams. One possible use of the Framework is as a source document to develop the Consortium and Member Effectiveness recommendations. The framework maps AEBG objectives and metrics onto a student flow and Describes potential activities consortia and members can take to make progress.

AEBG Student Progress Framework

Completion by Design Momentum Framework	Connection	Entry	Progress		Completion	
AEBG Objectives	Objectives 1, 2, 4		Objectives 3, 5		Objectives 5, 6, 7	
AEBG Indicator Framework	Adults Served	Participants	Student Progress	Transition	Completion	Outcomes After Exit
AEBG Metrics	Reportable Individual: 1+ hour or svsl	Participant: 12+ contact hours	Interim Progress Meas's 1. EFL Level Attainment 2. CB21 Level Progress 3. Occup. Skills Gain 4. Workforce Prep MS	ABE/ESL to ASE Transition to Postsecondary	HS Diploma or Equivalent Postsecondary Credential	Employment Wage Increase College Credit Award
Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand/improve outreach & marketing to target populations 2. Improve/redesign student intake processes 3. Deeper engagement w students regarding goals and longer term educational opportunity 4. Improve initial student data collection 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase number of ABE/ASE/ESL courses based on community need/demand 2. Reallocate offerings geographically based on regional demographic shifts 3. Increase course articulation agreements or dual/co-enrollment between K12 & CC 4. Increase offerings & enrollment in IET & pathway programs 5. Implement consortia-wide agreement for placement into college level courses using EFL's and other student persistence measures 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase offering of postsecondary CTE credential programs 2. Improve alignment of CTE credential programs with labor mkt demand 3. Increase offerings & enrollment in IET & pathway programs 4. Improve information about pathways and career opportunities at intake 5. Increase articulation & dual/co-enrollment between K12 AE/CC 6. Improve collection of emp/wage data 7. Increase student participation in WBL activities connect to pathways 	