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# I. RESOURCES (formerly FUNDING)

**Is the scope of this working group specific enough? How could it be improved?**

Subgroups should be created to ensure detailed analysis of each area. Examples: 1) Quantity, 2) Diversity, 3) Distribution, 4) Impact.

The current scope assumes existing funding versus expanding it. Bring in business and identify beneficiaries/public/private partnerships. Reevaluate the metrics uses in the funding formula – it’s not transparent/accountable.

Acknowledge all stakeholders and sources of funding beyond RIDE (articulate funding).

It’s broad – like a vision statement. If it has specific objectives then will be okay.

**How can this working group ensure that its recommendations are applicable?**

Recommendations need to be:

* Realistic
* Attached to a system of implementation/process
* Need to talk about the system/process that is going to make this happen
* One of the members of each group should be a policy maker

How are funding decisions driving the direction our field needs to move into? Innovation funding -> think and do differently and foster collaboration.

How can 16-17 year old funding follow the youth students to the adult education system?

Need a system for GED/NEDP – separate?

Regional funding formula? Plan?

**What information will this working group need?**

1) Quantity – info/data from RIDE/from other state models, K-12 money follows ALP students; 2) Distribution – Performance based funding, transportation, RI federal incentive grant ($3M); 3) Diversity – What do other states do? Review integration of all money; 4) Impact – Enrollment, pop-up programs (non-RIDE)

What is the “maximized” amount? What about full-time staffing?

**What questions should guide this working group?**

* Performance based funding revised?
* How can RI funding maximize collaboration and innovation?
* Can funding help with transportation for adult ed students?
* How will we provide equitable resources for regions?
* How to quickly get resources to follow 16-17 year olds?
* What is a public-private partnership to systematize?

**What are some possible responses to the guiding questions?**

Possibly rewarding retention without penalizing drop-off; performance-based funding is a bonus – so programs aren’t competing; transportation – asking K-12 to contribute, RIPTA shuttles in areas?

**What other questions need to be considered by this working group?**

As is now – the money (funding) determines what programs offer – learners need to dictate what services are offered. What unique qualities does RI have that need to be kept in mind? Culture (don’t travel far), size, population.

**What are the risks and opportunities that this group needs to consider or address?**

Opportunities: collaboration, innovation, $ following students (ALP students) for tests and attendance and truancy and transportation needs; possibility of mobile locations to address transportation needs (funding could be central, programs local)

Risks: Funding forcing programming rather than being based on need

**Other Notes**

Performance based funding continuing to be adversarial – stifling collaboration; rewarding retention while penalizing attrition

None can be done at RIDE unless new commissioner and Governor and legislature makes suggestions a priority

# II. ACCESS

**Is the scope of this working group specific enough? How could it be improved?**

We have no services for learning disabled and low literacy students. Where to refer them? How to report outcomes? How to increase retention over years of possible training? Should be a working group devoted to this, so we can serve outside of our programs. Referral system? Intra-agency/inter-agency directory updated annually.

No, because access has a variety of definitions and barriers – break out into areas such as:

* Visibility: awareness, marketing, existence relevance
* Affordability ($300 NEDP)
* Travel – time and costs limit access

1. Ensure access for people looking for adult education
2. Can the system serve over 100,000?
3. There are a couple of questions involved in the access group – divide the focus

**How can this working group ensure that its recommendations are applicable?**

GWB needs an employer advisory board to discuss needs, gaps, incentives, advocacy for the clients. Connecting clients to training programs. Connect GWB ith adult education to provide more feedback from employers.

Develop recommendations that are specific, measurable, “SMART”; composition of working groups include representatives from all constituencies – learners, employers, educators, administrators, funders, elected officials (but transportation)

1. Identify whose job it is – state-level, not at local levels
2. Develop clear messages to deliver to this person/group that show how it ties to their job mission
3. Establish accountability points and tie it to this person’s job outcomes
4. If it’s not currently someone’s job, make it so!

* Diverse participation
* Combine funding sources that support ABE services and outcomes through WIOA
* Utilize different state agency leaders to build awareness to collaborate
* Utilize RFP to ensure collaboration and program unity

**What information will this working group need?**

1. data about current student base but also those not in programs
2. currently how does population learn where to go for access
3. is there funding for outreach and communications

Relationships with employers and schools

Types of workforce pathways that are needed, to bring people through from low-level to functioning level literacy and life skills.

* Current access points to the system
* Are there qualifying steps for participants to access programming?
* How are participants referred if they don’t quality?

**What questions should guide this working group?**

1. Where are we now
2. What is the need for the students in the system and outside the system
   1. System – where are the entry/access points in the system for low literacy, transition, math literacy; define those entry points through the region
   2. Services – what type of services?
      1. Online classes
      2. Classes during the weekend
      3. Transportation (use school buses – not the public transportation system)
      4. Child care
      5. Other services
      6. Youth programs (16-24 year olds)
      7. Leadership development skills
      8. An alumni association
3. Define each component (system, services) that will ensure access
4. What is the ultimate actionable goal – put ourselves to work

Where is the money and infrastructure for support to create a successful program for actual low-level literacy? Poverty is a literacy issue. How can we follow up and track for those who cannot/do not want to obtain GED/NEDP? There must be options. What are they? One Stops are a barrier.

Do all the collaborators responsible for adult education feel that access is an issue?

Doe we have relationships with all critical employers?

How do we help agencies get visibility in the school system?

Are all materials and information in many languages?

How do you do outreach to the 100,000 residents in need?

How to expand the One Stops to actually be a one-stop system for ABE and workforce development and Job Corps and college access?

How are youth centers supporting actual ABE services, programs and participant outcomes?

**What are some possible responses to the guiding questions?**

What are the different points of entry?

Do providers have expertise in certain areas so that points of entry are clear?

Still need to coordinate services

How to students know which class/progra to go to – how do they know what they need?

Look at the United Way 2015 report, put in place a process to elicit student response (inside and outside the system)

1. Dedicate money to low-literacy populations and adjust performance measures for these groups; provide adequate professional development and programming for low-literacy learners; need for appropriate programs and technology; increase access points; align with learning disability asessment; no one is equipped to accommodate learning disabilities; need trained educators for learning disabilities in adult education
2. Review/redesign intake process to improve results; streamline a unified intake and assessment process to facilitate referrals and reduce duplication of efforts
3. Create comprehensive, updated inter-agency directory
4. Create a “district center” for assessment and evaluation; centralize intake, evaluation and assessment OR encourage regional groups, support, referrals, etc.

**What other questions need to be considered by this working group?**

How to “systematize” connections for social services, education, workforce development, etc.?

Do we need a marketing plan?

Goal to have an entry point and ongoing support through education continuum – how to navigate?

“First touch” with students is very important

Case management and tracking are important

Can we envision other options for students accessing the system on a semester based rather than annual based funding system?

Look at different equivalent tests for learner access

What does an assessment that identifies what learners need, who can best serve them, etc. look like? How to make sure this happens?

How would the system be structured ideally?

Identify 3 high-need areas to inform structure

Could there be a state-level access coordinator to ensure access is maximized?

How to ensure promotion of communication at state level which supports access?

How do we get more learners through the door?

Unified process with ORS, DLT, DHS, etc. – who trains other organizations about adult education? adult education needs to inform and train other partners about opportunities; these groups can be difficult to contact and unresponsive.

Tracking and case management – need an information system that provides systematic history of students from 1st contact through – all application, assessment, enrollment, etc.; Access for 100,000 so they know that we exist, who to call, where to find us...

**What are the risks and opportunities that this group needs to consider or address?**

Look at \_\_\_\_\_ enrollment vs. open enrollment (benefits and risks)

Risks: How do we ensure meaningful feedback and listening to the unknown students who can’t access the system as opposed to making assumptions and decisions out of context?

Opportunity: If adult education practitioners receive professional development and are credentialed

Need “cultural guides for outreach”

Public libraries – have lots of resources to help students with workforce entry and training

Continuous services

Marketing campaign – branding

Challenges of serving high-risk populations, ex. homeless

Structure cannot be established without identifying high-need areas

Stop out students’ situation

Challenges: Transportation and child care

**Other Notes**

1. Inter-agency information will facilitate collaborations and referrals and [info about] need
2. Employers could bring information to adult education about gaps and available jobs
3. Low-literacy learners need more specialized programs and teachers and GED
4. Need professional development for all adult education practitioners along with collaboration and sharing, and planning time, via technology and in person

One shot programs with money -> pathway – gone; no sustainability, no real true connection to employment, no connection to employers; DLT and infrastructure including One Stops are not functional on behalf of any potential employees

How to reach people who are not already engaged in classes?

Interagency access

Important considerations:

* Distance learning, digital options, technology
* Cash award for innovation?

NCRC – national career readiness credential – needs employer buy-in

# III. CONNECTIONS

**Is the scope of this working group specific enough? How could it be improved?**

Could give examples of (both coming in and out of adult education) –

* Workforce development
* Training opportunities
* Employers
* Student supports (community, social, health)

Include who should be partnering with whom...formal agreements...

There are so many possible connections between outcomes, programs, students, state agencies, employers, etc.

**How can this working group ensure that its recommendations are applicable?**

Work with RIDE to ensure a fair funding structure that supports collaboration and shared outcomes/ownership – “networks”

Define priorities

Include end goals for service coordination statewide

Define what’s going to maintain collaborations and improve the outcomes

Make sure all stakeholders are involved

Need to be actionable

**What information will this working group need?**

Mapping of different services provided by region/network

* Adult education
* Training programs/CTE
* Employers - supports

**What questions should guide this working group?**

What existing/past examples of great collaboration exist?

How can improved connections trickle down to better opportunities for learners?

How can RIDE funding support greater connections for programs and learners?

Increased resources (funders and support)

**What are some possible responses to the guiding questions?**

**What other questions need to be considered by this working group?**

**What are the risks and opportunities that this group needs to consider or address?**

**Other Notes**

Summary of discussion: All stakeholders will work together to define connections that describe paths that cross agencies and meet learner needs.

# IV. ADVANCEMENT

**Is the scope of this working group specific enough? How could it be improved?**

The scope is not specific or clear enough and is limited. It could be improved by providing a definition of “advancement” and ways to actually achieve it – see also notes on index card.

It is much too broad. What is the system? Does the “system” include all adult education programs?

How does the system want to be identified – visibility as adult education or something else?

How does the system fit into workforce development so people with the lowest skills do not get lost?

Giving people pathways into the economy – not just workforce development

Field should have higher profile

**How can this working group ensure that its recommendations are applicable?**

The recommendations should be shared broadly and vetted by constituencies/stakeholders. The business community must support the recommendations.

RI needs a professional association for adult education. They can lobby on our behalf.

Is the system set up to be efficient?

Are we using money as efficiently as possible?

Are we mapping services to community demands?

**What information will this working group need?**

The information needed would include the skills and competency needs of educators (i.e. training, professional development), lessons learned about software, resources, teaching strategies, etc. and the specific skills required by employers.

Define the adult education system – who are the programs?

Are all adult education programs captured in CALIS, despite funding sources?

* Definition of visibility, infrastructure and practices
* Information about people with disabilities
* Look at relationships in RIDE
* Look at connections with higher education, charter schools, etc.

**What questions should guide this working group?**

How can adult education positions become full-time to professionalize the field?

What is the marketing/public relations plan for adult education?

Should we consider a lobbyist?

* What does the field of adult education want to be visible as? How does the field want to be identified?
* How are individual programs visible?
* Is the system efficient?

**What are some possible responses to the guiding questions?**

* Allowing time for foundational skills and not putting people in to jobs before they are ready; pushing people to get jobs
* Define out infrastructure and practices more 1, 2, 3, 4 – examples: calendar, orientation, quality, etc.
* Investment in the teachers, adequate time and compensation, better curriculum, instructional standards

**What other questions need to be considered by this working group?**

Is there job security, job advancement like in K-12 for teachers?

Where are the support services after students complete workforce programs, students no longer qualify for services to make a career jump (cost, time, child care, etc.) – post-training supports.

Career counseling and educational counseling to help people identify and map pathways.

Funding.

Agencies getting career and academic counselors – How? individualized plans, pathways.

Teacher quality, concrete syllabi at the program level with teacher input

Is there an appetite for more standardized curriculum across RI – so that referrals can be more fluid?

Balance of core competencies and creativity freedom for teachers.

Messaging to students about upward mobility, visibility to them too

How can we leverage social media to advance adult education?

**What are the risks and opportunities that this group needs to consider or address?**

Opportunity – strengthened collaborative adult education system; opportunity to professionalize the adult education field; maximize resources of agencies (technology, distance learning, expertise of instructors, case managers, CALIS)