Pathways-IET Field Team Notes
Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Overview/Synopsis: Much of the focus of today's Pathways-IET Field Team meeting was on defining a feasible and actionable scope of work for the team over the next year that we meet. Getting to this answer was driven by the definition of what a pathway is in adult education. This, in turn, led to a discussion of what adult education providers need in order provide career development to their students. The consensus among the field team members is that this looks different for every agency based on the needs of their students, the size of their agency, and where they are in the process of building their pathways. But the field team's product (guidance, resources, etc.) needs to be concrete and useful for adult education programs to use. We also need to leverage currently existing practices being implemented around the state (and beyond, as applicable) so we don't work on recreating what already exists in pathways. We will work on bringing in additional contributors as available and necessary and will use a number of communication platforms to collaborate on this work.

Attendance:

Peter Simon, Career Ladders Project, Field Team Facilitator
Jennifer Hernandez, Labor Agency, State of CA
Nohora Vasquez, Lake Elsinore USD
Beatriz Aguilar, MiraCosta CCD
Andria Keiser, Allan Hancock CCD
Jacques LaCour, Mid-Alameda County Consortium
JoDee Slyter, ABout Students Riverside
Darrell Parsons, AEBG TAP
Magdelena Kwiatkowski, San Diego CCD
John Russell, Monrovia USD
Adele McClain, Apple Valley USD
Cliff Moss, CDE
Emma Diaz, San Bernardino CCD Consortium
Wendy Miller, CCSF
Jaemi Naish, Tamalpais UHSD
Joyce Hinkson, OTAN

We started by looking at the blue scope of work language on the agenda.

Facilitator: Have to be smart about what our objectives are and what's doable. What do you think a set of items would look like? What recommendations should this field team make for the scope of work? We want to issue guidance on integrated pathways and effective pathway building.

Responses from Committee Members:

Link the first and fourth elements from the scope of work.

Define effective transitions.

There are pathways within agencies or institutions and then there are pathways across agencies. They can look very different. A student can get through a single agency pathway without ever touching a community college and then multi agency pathway does involve multiple partners. But both systems have multiple entrances and exits. So, need a road map of access points.

Facilitator: So, come up with a common definition of what a pathway is. Play off WIOA, etc., but what does it mean for us?

Facilitator: What are common elements of a pathway?

Facilitator: Seamless transitions.

Responses from Committee Members:

The term pathway needs to be defined.

So the student has clear guidance of what they need to do at any given point.

And there needs to be a clear definition of pathway across systems.

Educational vs Career pathways. There is a difference in goals between these two.

Student goals key to whatever pathway there is.

There need to be multiple options, entry points, and exit points as well as multiple options once within pathway.

Branches need to be available based on what steps/training has a student has already done. There also needs to be integrated support (health care)

Facilitator: This is a much broader terrain than just adult education students transitioning to community college.

Responses from Committee Members:

We need to use community-based organizations and transition students from those CBO programs into pathways, too. There are a lot of those students we're not serving.

There needs to be allowance for jumping around in different systems as part of the program. Cross-system and cross-program (including co-enrollment and dual enrollment).

There needs to be an allowance for multiple providers for a student at any given time. It's not necessarily sequential, could be simultaneous.

Facilitator: We also need to consider IET and that process of integration.

Response from Committee Member:

We need a clear road map as to how people can make IET happen with apportionment funding and collective bargaining agreements.

Facilitator: What do you think of when you see this scope of work list? The only way to handle this process is to start with the end in mind. What do we have from this scope of work that we can develop over the next year that is generally useful and doable for the field?

Responses from Committee Members:

How-to manual/framework/roadmap that is what you need to get started but it needs to be flexible to the needs of your community and the size of your system.

We need to be able to start small and build up.

K12 districts don't know where to start other than the basic four programs. They need a framework.

We need a how-to guide. We just hired a transitions counselor and are discovering so much we don't know how to do. We need to start pathways on a small scale based on what the pathway is (e.g., non-credit to credit, etc.) We need a how-to guide for any pathway agencies want to develop.

We're all going through that how-to phase, what works and what doesn't work.

It starts with student goals, so starting with an inquiry at the time of student enrollment through a school counselor that develops an individualized graduation plan the counselor helps students achieve. This leads to the development of a pathway. The plan includes the student's future workforce plans, FAFSA planning, etc.

We need a listserv and Wiki that connects to a shared repository of solutions from the field. Also need a shared Google Doc with FAQs of the challenges we all face.

Consider a hybrid of a decision-making guide and a how-to guide. Because how do you decide which how-to works for you? [Much agreement from team to this statement.]

Add different types of models that agencies can pick from.

It would be nice to have some recommended reading and white papers on this. People don't have the time to locate and read these resources.

This could be like a literature guide. If we had a website, it could be on there.

Regarding FERPA, the primary outcome of that legislation is employment and/or enrollment in a postsecondary institution. But our biggest problem in our consortium is a lack of ability to measure outcomes. We need a data system to measure this data. We just put it into TOPSpro Enterprise and hope it's hitting the target. So, we need data to gauge if we're doing what the legislation is actually asking us to do. Otherwise all this pathway work is for naught if we don't know if we're hitting the target.

Facilitator: All these field teams are intended to connect the dots so we are hitting these targets.

Responses from Committee Members:

I thought a major focus of AEBG is collaborating across these systems somehow?

LaunchBoard is intended to accomplish that.

Veritec (sp?) is an advising group to CCCCO and they've been talking about an actual data match and national clearinghouse using 1099s.

Facilitator: We started AEBG in part to track how many are transitioning form AE to CC.

Responses from Committee Members:

That was what FERPA was supposed to accomplish. But the community college we work with said they couldn't do it and that was the end of the conversation. The college will not change the drop down to include adult education programs in their geographic area within their online application.

We've had some luck doing that.

I was going to try to do it from counselor to counselor and the community college said they couldn't do that.

We have same problem.

Our understanding is that LaunchBoard is going to solve this.

But LaunchBoard will still only be aggregated data and decision making so it won't solve this problem of individual student tracking.

It would be a great start if community colleges honored SSIDs and used those to track individual students.

I want to just pick one item from the blue list and concentrate on it for the year.

I can see that but I'm worried that some consortia are much further ahead in pathway development than others, so there should be an effort to build a framework for a few of the scope of work items so our work is useful for all agencies.

Facilitator: Maybe we should divide up this work among the field team and then come back together.

Response from Committee Member: There are too many elements in this list.

Facilitator: Regarding the third bullet, "Create CCCCO…" CLASP has outstanding materials on this so I don't think we need to take that one on.

Responses from Committee Members:

Or maybe it could be part of effective transitions work because a lot of people don't know about this or have a handle on it.

Maybe Judy Mortrude needs to be in the room for that conversation.

Facilitator: The first and fourth items can be combined.

Responses from Committee Members:

What was the writer's intent in separating those out?

The fourth came from community college regional consortia work based on the recognition that economies are regional, not local, and students move around, too.

Facilitator: We need to define the word regional. It could be within one consortium or could be groups of consortia working together.

Responses from Committee Members:

There already is a field team working on professional development (the fourth item), so do we need to take that on?

The first bullet is trying to understand the map. And then the fourth is how we align the resources for strategies and professional development.

Facilitator: What do we start with?

Responses from Committee Members:

The first item is the raison d'etre for AEBG. And number four is meta-mapping above and beyond what one entity can accomplish alone. There are lots of factors involved in that (LMI, regional planning, etc.).

We'll only be able to acknowledge it's there and include it in our tool kit we develop.

Facilitator: The first two items are plenty to work on. We also need to add 'to employment' at the end of first item.

Response from Committee Member:

A lot of agencies in the field are ready for the fifth item and to engage on it but they're stuck because it's very confusing.

Facilitator: We could link the fifth item once we address the first and second items. There are some resources to build your capacity.

Response from Committee Member:

I agree regarding focusing on items 1, 2, and 5. I don't even know what item 3 is intending to mean.

Facilitator: Let's split the field team to tackle 1, 2, and 5.

Response from Committee Member:

We need to make sure K12 districts and community colleges are represented in each of the three groups.

Facilitator: By today, let's figure out what we want to do with this field team and how we'll go about doing it.

Responses from Committee Members:

I heard from this group earlier to not reinvent the wheel. Let's find resources and curate them and get them onto a web-based tool and determine how best to present them.

I love the idea of finding demonstration sites and sharing them.

Facilitator: There is lots of professional development on data and accountability. We need more on pathways.

Responses from Committee Members:

I really liked the Community Asset Mapping webinar AEBG presented two weeks ago (February 21).

[The field team split into three groups to discuss scope of work items 1, 2, and 5.]

Facilitator: We are brainstorming what it would look like to come up with some sort of output for each of these three items.

Group 1 notes:

This items states: Issue guidance on integrated pathways and effective transition of students between systems.

Responses from Committee Members:

What are IPs exactly referring to? Integrated workforce? Integrated programs? Other? To produce some kind of transition. Need to define some sort of integrated model?

Wordsmith to say effective trans within and between systems. Because it assumes too much that school systems are already integrated well.

We've developed a "figure eight" road map because students may return to the same resources within the system based on their needs.

How many supports could we bring to a given student? We should give them options to pick from right when they register. How can we integrate pathways at that moment? Give them all the options at the outset to lead to effective transitions. Give them the resources to transition to whatever pathway they want. Students get motivated by knowing their options even if they

don't pursue all of those pathways right away. This creates awareness among students of what's available to them.

We would need to make those guiding plans regionally. It would be nice to make it for the state, but that doesn't seem to happen.

We need to keep it narrow and start with one element. We can identify that element and then develop that list of resources to know and then share what is available for that element.

I also see an effective transition system as being capable of seeing the barriers that exist to develop resources to overcome those barriers.

Some examples of those barriers are training and support for welfare recipients.

ESL student transitions also have barriers. Some need jobs but aren't eligible for programs others can use to get a job. So, do I set up my own vocational system?

Community colleges are not all honoring some of the support systems set up for students who need them.

We also need to increase research on apprenticeships and other systems other than America's Job Center resources.

Pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs make a huge difference.

Auditing classes helps a lot because students can take those courses for less tuition and then take a test to get credit for it. It's a workaround we've used.

That could be called an alternative pathway.

Mirrored classes are another workaround.

Effective' means a student needs to be able to walk out of a program or system with some sort of certificate.

IET at K12 is trying to mirror the minimum threshold community colleges use (e.g., 48 hours in class) for credit. We're also trying to bring community college courses to K12 campuses and integrate the system this way.

We provide support by trying to make sure bilingual instructors teach dual enrollment courses. This is funded through LCAP. We also have a one unit guidance course to support students.

Would knowing LMI be the first step to starting a program/system? We should be showing our students what the most viable career pathways are and what it takes to get there.

We did this to make sure we didn't duplicate efforts among educational systems.

Did your consortium hire someone to focus on LMI for your particular labor market?

Yes, because we are not using truly local data.

Your local labor board could maybe tease out really local data from regional data.

The Strong Workforce office can get local labor data, too.

The content for resources and research will have to be gathered on all these topics and more and then we need to find a coherent way to organize and present them so they are practical and can be communicated to the field or be put into a how-guide. But we've identified a lot of the areas that need to be included in this.

We want to make sure we're not duplicating the efforts of WIOA agencies.

Do we want to have the field develop these resources?

They could be identified from the web. The AEBG Office would need to get consortia to identify themselves as having programs worth taking a look at, including both small-scale and large-scale programs. The Practices with Promise resources we supply to the AEBG Office could be a starting point—any of those resources that are related to pathway development.

We could look out-of-state at locations like Minnesota for resources.

Tennessee has a good workforce application because it is one unified online application.

Glendale, CA, has good resources for student registration, too.

There needs to be good collaboration so systems hold together.

[Reported out what subgroups discussed.]

Group 1:

[See notes above from Group 1 discussion.]

Group 2:

We need to make sure we don't reinvent the wheel. We need to look at successful models like the Navigator model in Minnesota and Los Angeles. We need to have somebody embedded from the consortia in Workforce Development Board world.

What are the state investments from across all state agencies? We need to create asset maps to highlight the state agency, what they're doing to serve the client, and how much money are they providing through these services.

It would be great for the field team and the AEBG Office to get behind an effort to have a uniform SSID system. We should use the $5,000,000 from the Governor's proposed budget for this system. Then we could share outcomes effectively.

We need to have a commitment to amalgamate the money provided by the state to drive the field to certain behaviors. This would incentivize behaviors and actions by the field.

Group 5:

Define Capacity – Is it the capacity of agencies/institutions to design pathways? Or is it increasing the capacity of pathways to serve students within pathways that are being designed? Or is it both?

Capacity translates into time and money. We need time for reflection and planning, not just doing.

Create a safe space for the hard conversations that will need to take place to come up with an agreed-upon working definition and common understanding of 'career pathway', then move on to the design and implementation.

Involve employers in planning meetings.

How do we partner with employers and CBOs? What does an authentic partnership look like? We need a model this (not just letter of support for grant).

We need a tool kit on how to get resources from employers. Learn what they need and utilize what we have to accomplish that.

Provide a "how to" guide for leveraging funding sources and creating worthwhile and effective partnerships.

We need resources on integrated planning and leveraging other categorical funds (Student Equity, BSI, SSSP, Perkins, SWP)

We need to share resources on design thinking, human-centered design with practitioners as they design pathways

We need to include resources on adult education instructional design for practitioners

It comes down to time and money for this, as well. We currently don't have enough of these resources to build pathways or an asset map.

There is a need for funding flexibility to be able to put the money where it is most needed – need this from the state.

Don't recreate the wheel. Seek out current literature and available guidance that already exists.

Visit agencies that are implementing the process you want for your agency; ask questions.

Any plan that is created needs to be based on data (i.e., market info, jobs numbers, etc.) – need from Data and Accountability Team/CASAS.

[Whole Field Team Discussion continues.]

Facilitator: Would everyone agree that we table items 3 and 4 from the scope of work or fold them into what we're doing on 1, 2, and 5? [Agreed]

Facilitator: Is there anyone else we should invite for this work?

Responses from Committee Members:

Get CBOs involved. We have a hard time getting them to the table.

An information technology (IT) person would be useful to get systems to communicate with each other.

We should get the Building Skills Partnership involved. They work with SEIU.

Someone from state board of Cal Works or social service providers would also be useful.

We should get Judy Mortrude to participate. [Agreement from the rest of the field team.]

Facilitator: I will put together a Google Drive document and listserv as a collective repository and alert system when new things are added to it.

[Worked on rough timeframe for next meeting. Late April/early May. Fridays. Carolyn Zachry enters conversation and shares she'll be working with Diana Batista to find facility space.]

Wrap-up comments from Committee Members:

It has been great to hear the concerns of the different agencies.

This is a tough topic because it can be very conceptual. So, we need to be concrete to provide clear guidance and resources to the field.

I agree because we were too conceptual over summer with the last field teams and it was frustrating.

I will invite this group using Basecamp to have an ongoing exchange regarding notes, collaboration, etc.