AB 86: Adult Education

Webinar Series

http://ab86.ccco.edu

7-10-2015

Agenda for Today's Webinar

- Quick Update
- Focus Group Process
- Guiding Principles
- Sources of Information
- Timeline
- Emerging Perspectives
  - Accountability
  - Allowability
  - Governance

Quick Update

- MOE
- Regional Consortia
- Guidelines
- Grant Deliverables
- Next Steps

Disclaimer

- For today's exercise…..
- This is the DRAFT that reflects current thinking.
- It is not official, it will be edited, and it should not be used as guidelines at this time.
- It is subject to change.
- Feedback on today's material…..
  - Today – via chat room and the AB86 inbox
  - Afterwards – via the AB86 inbox ab86@cccco.edu

Focus Group Process

- CDE and Chancellor's Office pulled together a balanced team to provide input into guidance for the adult education block grant.

- Eight field representatives balanced between K-12 and community college.

- Began meeting Monday, June 15th.

- Field input/comment on draft guidance through July.

- Training and technical assistance over the summer.

Focus Group Process (cont.)

Main Question: What are the guidelines the consortia need to follow in order to comply with the AEBG legislation during 2015/2016 academic year?

Intent: Develop these guidelines through an inclusive and transparent process that results in pragmatic solutions to critical questions that need to be answered in the very short term.

Focus Group Process (cont. 2)

- While the latest legislative language explicitly specifies certain expectations, some questions and terms will need to be additionally specified in guidelines by the CDE and the Chancellor's Office.

- The subgroups explored and assessed various options to answer outstanding questions, recognizing that there are tradeoffs associated with the degree of prescriptiveness of the guidelines.

Guiding Principles

- During this process, the focus group used the guiding principle to allow for maximum local flexibility - within the intentions of AEBG.

- The reason behind this strategy is that the focus group recognized the diverse nature of consortia, the need to rebuild, and the large amount of work that needs to happen in a short period of time.

- Whenever the focus group had a choice, they leaned towards the minimalistic approach.

Sources of Information

In the development of guidelines, the focus group followed the following hierarchy of consideration:

- AB104 Language
- AB86 Language / Report / Guidelines
- Legislative language precedents in other places
- Best practices, case studies

Sources of Information (cont.)

The focus group also considered additional sources of information:

- Based on input from the field - through surveys, WebEx comments, email input, and more - thank you very much!
- There was an overwhelming sentiment towards need for local flexibility (which contradicts need for specificity).

Deliverables for AEBG

– Allocation schedule approval

– Updated plans

– Updated Consortia information

– Effectiveness / Outcomes

– Data Collection

– Assessment Plan

– Governance Rules

– Budget & Expenditure Reporting

– Unbelievable busy!!

Emerging Perspectives

- ACCOUNTABILITY

- What measures will be used to assess effectiveness per 84920?

- How will consortia & LEAs collect and report data to the State?

- How do we define consortia effectiveness beyond the explicit metrics?

- How do we implement a menu of common assessments and policies regarding placement of adults into adult education programs?

- How will the interests of diverse stakeholders be protected?

Emerging Perspectives

- ALLOWABILITY

- What expenditures will be allowable?

- How will "mixed use" expenditure be allowed?

- How will the allowed 7 areas be defined?

- When/how/should consortia amend their plans to include the newly added programs/members?

- What can be included in the 5% admin cost cap?

- Will the consortia comprehensive plans drive the MOE expenditures?

Emerging Perspectives

- GOVERNANCE

- How will required consortia Rules and procedures (per 84905) be developed?

- What should the timing be for development and approval of the required rules and procedures for each consortium so they can get funding?

Question	What measures will be used to assess effectiveness per 84920?
Background	(1) How many adults are served by members of the consortium. (2) How many adults served by members of the consortium have demonstrated the following: (A) Improved literacy skills. (B) Completion of high school diplomas or their recognized equivalents. (C) Completion of postsecondary certificates, degrees, or training programs. (D) Placement into jobs. (E) Improved wages.
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, 84920, explicitly mandates certain measures that must be used. **Second**, these shall be collected by program area and by member - and rolled up at consortia level (and then, at state level) **Third**, for 2015/16 we will not require ADDITIONAL metrics , but we anticipate with time we will get more sophisticated in measuring and tracking effectiveness.
Next steps	1. Discuss definition of specific metrics, so that results can be rolled over to state level, eg, how will improved literacy rates be measured? How will placement into jobs be measured? etc.

Question	How will consortia & LEAs collect and report data to the State?
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, we reiterate that these guidelines are for 2015/16 only. With time, the State plans on developing a tracking system. **Second**, the intent for 2015/16 is to collect only the legislatively mandated data elements to minimize reporting burden. **Third**, we lean toward the option to allow regional consortia to use local systems & processes and report data into a State level adult education database. **Fourth**, many specific questions remain - eg, - What will training and technical assistance look like? - What will this state database look like? These will be resolved over the coming weeks and communicated on a timely manner.
Next steps	1. Verify if separate funds will be designated for statewide tracking system. 2. Keep thinking through detailed questions 3. what does the reporting system look like

Question	How do we define consortia effectiveness beyond the explicit metrics?
Background	See AB104 requirements.
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, the intent is to develop a "checklist" tool of mandated areas from the budget bill. **Second**, at the highest level, the "checklist" will address the questions: - Based on the required content, does the consortium have a well-formulated regional plan (strategy)? 3 year plan? Annual plan? - Is the consortium executing against its plan (activity)? - Is the consortium achieving results (outcomes)? - Did the consortium provide the necessary information to the State (assessment policy, governance rules and procedures, budget, data collection process, consortia members, services, etc)? **Third,** we will follow fact-based approach, leveraging data collected from DOF mandated areas as compared to need in the regional consortium area to develop an effectiveness scorecard.
Next steps	1. Detail the intended checklist tool. 2. Develop effectiveness scorecard.

Question	How do we implement a menu of common assessments and policies regarding placement of adults into adult education programs?
Background	See AB104 requirements.
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, the intent is to develop a statewide menu of common assessment using the approved assessment under the WIOA Title II grant and the approved assessments under the Common Assessment Initiative (CA Community Colleges). **Second**, each consortium would be required to develop the following: - A regional assessment policy describing how the adult education providers will coordinate the use of assessment tools in the region. - Create a crosswalk showing how assessment scores in the region align and crosswalk so students are not taking multiple tests and a variety of assessments. **Third,** the State will examine the regional assessment policy and the crosswalk along with program outcomes to verify that the regional consortium is operating efficiently and effectively in moving students through their regional adult education system.
Next steps	1. Create an approved menu of common assessments. 2. Create a template for a regional assessment policy and regional assessment crosswalk.

Question	What expenditures will be allowable?

Emerging point of view / status	**First**, given the need to rebuild and the vast differences across consortia of what is needed to do so, the general stance for 2015/2016 is intended to be permissive. **Second**, to be specific: Any expenditure is allowable as long as it
	- meets the AEBG restrictions (ie, 7 funded areas for adults 18 and over),
	  - is part of the approved consortium plan, and
	  - does not violate general restrictions on public funds.
	Third, while the plans submitted in March are considered "approved", any further amendments must follow adopted Rules and Procedures

Additional info	Examples of allowable expenditures, provided these are included in the approved consortium plan: Teachers/Direct instruction, Professional development, Student supports, Counseling services, upgrades, IT investments, Student supplies, Research to support programs, Curriculum alignment & development, Legal fees, convening, project manager to coordinate activities Examples of non-allowable expenditures - Spend for programs that do not fit the 7 AEBG program areas. K12 districts can still offer additional adult ed programs, but cannot fund them with AEBG money. - Spend on students younger than 18 (do not fit AEBG's definition of adult). Members can still serve younger students, but cannot use AEBG to cover their costs.

Question	How will "mixed use" expenditure be allowed?
Background	Certain expenditures will benefit students outside AEBG - eg, classes also attended by students younger than 18 years old, or a computer lab used by adult students enrolled in non-AEBG programs **84900.** The Adult Education Block Grant Program is hereby established under the administration of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. **84901.** For purposes of this article, the following definitions shall apply, unless otherwise specified: (a) "Adult" means a person 18 years of age or older.
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, "Mixed use" expenditures will be allowed under AEBG only to the extent applicable - ie, these will be pro-rated. **Secondly,** that DOES NOT mean that schools and colleges can not serve students that do not classify as "adult" (older than 18), or programs that do not fit the AEBG areas; it simply means, these have to be paid with alternative money streams

Question	How will the allowed 7 areas be defined?
Background	Previously, only 5 areas were defined, and certain confusion remained for those 5
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, for consistency, we will build on the previously published definitions used during the AB86 planning process **Second**, the 2 new areas (older adults) and (assisting K-12 students) must be defined. See above. **Third,** remaining confusion must be clarified - eg, allowability of credit pre-apprenticeship programs, and of existing parent academies/universities.
Next steps	1.Carry over AB86 definitions into AEBG Glossary 2.Define new areas 3.Address specific questions

![AB86 — COLLABORATING TO BETTER SERVE THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF ADULTS](logo)

Question	When/how/should consortia amend their plans to include the newly added programs/members?
Background	Perceived contradiction in the language between sticking to the original plans vs. allowing a new areas of funding (especially for parents; other new program maps to CTE) and new members (eg, County offices of Education)
Emerging point of view / status	**First,** AB104 explicitly states that all 7 areas can be funded; therefore, not allowing the 2 new programs is not an option. **Second,** Consortia will have the choice to amend their plans to include new areas - either for 2015/16 through a special process, or for 2016/17 through their annual plan update process. **Third,** Consortia must follow prescribed decision-making requirements when amending their plan (eg, open meeting, participation, etc.) **Fourth,** there will be a specific process to relay the changes to CCC/CDE after amendments.
Next steps	1.**Investigate** related departments/ agencies to coordinate with on the new areas and include in the "open comment" process

Question	What can be included in the 5% admin cost cap?
Emerging point of view / status	**First,** we intend to take a narrow interpretation of admin costs to provide maximum consortium flexibility. **Second,** we are still detailing the specifics under two scenarios: with fund administrator (fiscal agent) and direct disbursement. **Third**, what we anticipate will NOT be included in the admin costs for the purposes of the 5% cap are: • Salaries and benefits: AE teachers/faculty, counselors, advisors, administrators, coordinators, certificated support staff, classified support staff **NOTE: AEBG Project Coordinator / Facilitator would be expensed in this category (outside of the 5%)** • Maintenance and custodial supplies • Instructional Support: Materials and supplies, Technology and equipment • Services: Contracts, Professional development, Marketing and outreach, Internships and externships
Next steps	Continue the discussions

Question	Will the consortia comprehensive plans drive the MOE expenditures?
Background	Confusion since MOE is dedicated to k12 schools
Emerging point of view / status	**YES.** The intent of the law is to allocate consortia-level funds across all providers for the maximum benefit to adult learners - see 84909 The MOE process is a one-time k12 funding mechanism (only in 2015/2016).

Question	How will required consortia Rules and procedures (per 84905) be developed?
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, in the spirit of local flexibility, there will be no mandated single template with uniform language for all consortia. Each consortia will develop and formally adopt their own Rules and Procedures that meet legal requirements. **Second**, to ensure minimum consistency and compliance with the Law, the AB104 implementation guidelines will include a list of required elements to be included in individual Rules and Procedures (eg., decision making rules, public notice rules, rules for adding/removing members, etc.) **Third,** to support consortia in their efforts, CDE/CCC will create an online questionnaire form that will prompt consortia to think through all required elements and offer additional information as appropriate. The finalized version of the Rules and Procedures form must be approved by the Governing Body of each member, and by CDE/CCC in order to be enacted. **Fourth**, in addition, to support consortia, CDE/CCC will host a resource library of approved consortia Rules and Regulations that others may use as reference documents.

Additional info	**Example 1**: Frequent question is how will decisions be made.
	 AB104 specifies that
	    1) All members MUST participate in the decision-making process.
	    2) A member is any (formally accepted) – CCD, K-12, COE, Joint Powers Authority
	    3) Each member has an formally designated official.
	
	 However, AB104 does not specify:
	    1) How many votes does each member have? (e.g.: 1 member=1 vote, 1 institution=1vote, votes proportionate to adult students served)
	    2) How many votes are needed to approve a decision? (e.g.: 51%? 50%+1 vote? ⅔ of votes? consensus?)
	 Under this guideline, each consortia will have to agree on how they want to be jointly making decisions and include it in their Rules and Procedures.
	 Example 2: Brown Act or no Brown Act - up to each Consortia to decide how to adhere to public notice process

Question	What should the timing be for development and approval of the required rules and procedures for each consortium be so they can get the 2015/16 consortia funding?
Background	Consortia have a long list of deliverables over short period of time
Emerging point of view / status	**First**, Rules and procedures MUST be formalized before 2015/16 money is distributed. FYI, money must be available to be distributed by Oct/ Nov 2015, though CDE/CCC are working hard to making funding available sooner. **Second**, Possible sequence of events: *Each member's Governance Board designates an "official" to the consortia *These officials collectively drafts / deliberates / agrees / approves "Rules and procedures" - drawing on what they've developed for the planning - use the Rules and Procedures questionnaire as a guide *CCC/CDE approves individual "rules and procedures" *Consortia develop proposed decision for distribution schedule and any plan amendments *Consortia goes through open meeting process to formally approve the distribution schedule and amendments *Consortia develops the required budget documentation and follow administrative process for fund release
Next steps	How should consortia be supported to AGREE on rules and procedures in a timely effort?

Question	How will the interests of diverse stakeholders be protected?
Emerging point of view / status	**First,** Consortia will go through due process to deliberate and develop proposed decisions, which then will be subject to public comment before final approval. **Second**, "The letter of the law" provides strict rules around public comments, partner outreach, etc. that ensure that anyone can voice their opinions. Thus, ANYONE, can offer their views and concerns when proposed decisions are presented. **Third**, "The spirit of the law" aims to optimize outcomes for adult learners through an inclusive and transparent process. As such, Consortia may chose to create new or leverage existing forums to engage partners and stakeholders (eg, advisory groups, task forces, user panels, etc.) in the process of deliberating and developing proposed decisions. **Fourth**, each "member official" should consider the various interests within their member district/organization when participating in consortia decision making. Specific processes to be explicitly discussed within member organizations.
Next steps	Consider including a prompt in the Rules and Procedures tools

AB86@cccco.edu