

Summary Notes

AB2098 Work Group Meeting of May 8, 2019

Facilitators: Paul Downs and Jacques LaCour

Work Group members in attendance *in person*:

- Liza Becker, Mt. San Antonio College
- Laura Chardiet, Los Angeles Unified School District
- Sofia Ramirez Gelpi, Allan Hancock College
- Bob Harper, South Bay Consortium for Adult Education
- Jennifer Hernandez, California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
- Janeth Manjarrez, North Orange Continuing Education
- Marcela Ruiz, California Department of Social Services
- Santosh Seeram-Santana, Chinese for Affirmative Action
- John Werner, Sequoias Adult Education Consortium

Work Group members in attendance *via Zoom*:

- Sasha Feldstein, California Immigrant Policy Center

State Leadership members in attendance in person:

- Carolyn Zachry, CDE
- Javier Romero, CCCCCO
- Neil Kelly, CAEP
- Carmen Martinez-Calderon, CDE

Guest organizations attending via Zoom:

- CASAS
- Migration Policy Institute
- Office of the Governor

Guest organization submitting written comments in advance of the meeting:

- Stanford University's Immigration Policy Laboratory

CAEP TAP Leadership and support staff attending in person:

- Diana Batista
- Liberty Van Natten
- Holly Clark

The main purpose of the May 8 meeting was to review the first full draft recommendations document to ensure Work Group agreement regarding its basic structure, format and content, and to gather additional input on core recommendations and areas in need of further development. Additionally, the group discussed prospective next steps and timelines.

The meeting began with an orientation to the goals of the day and a retrospective review of input, discussions and activities to date that shaped the draft recommendations document. In response to a request for a reminder of the recipients and processing of the recommendations, Paul Downs explained that they are first submitted to Carolyn, Javier and Gina, who then deliver final recommendations in their Oct. 1 CAEP report to the legislature.

In the review of Findings, there was general agreement that the structure and content were on target. Additional input/comment included:

1. Consider showing side by side data: CAEP population in ESL/covered by EL Civics and I2 numbers and needs in non-ESL programs
2. It is important to note that economic stability indicators are universal, not just for the immigrant population
3. Consider changing “citizens” to a more accurate and appropriate term

A discussion of field needs and resources for implementation included the following comments:

1. Some CAEP programs and agencies are currently stretched in terms of funding and resources; must keep incentives in mind to inspire agencies to get to outcomes
2. Conversely, other agencies are seeking ways to expend their funding; because CAEP specifically states that a key purpose is to serve immigrants, it may not be necessary to offer incentives to agencies that don’t have the same budget constraints as others
3. The data generated by metrics implementation itself is incentive for some
4. Even if all barriers were removed the CAEP system couldn’t approach meeting 100% of need
5. We’re looking at issues of needs, services and metrics with new eyes and across systems; we should question assumptions about our existing systems, be extremely clear as to how/if we’re addressing the needs, and seize the opportunity to recommend new partnerships and creative approaches to fill gaps and meet needs.

The Work Group reached a basic agreement that the AB2098 recommendations should express a goal of reaching more immigrants to provide services while for the moment not identifying which agencies or agency types should provide specific services. This is in keeping with the broad scope articulated in the underlying legislation (AB104), which calls for working with partners to provide a wide range of services.

A discussion of expanding capacity included the following comments:

1. Focus on offering a variety of services (informational, educational, developmental, etc.) via a new portable model that could be offered by any agency.
2. Create a system that allows partners to serve communities where they are
3. Offer modular package/bundled competencies; USA Learns as example
4. Create broader capacity that lives outside of any one institutional structure
5. The needs include a bundle of policy, procedures, protocols and practices
6. In looking for frameworks to meet needs of specific communities, it may be that a student portfolio and digital badges may not be a fit for all
7. Conversations should stay in a more visceral frame: focus on serving individuals, whether or not they are currently AE students

The group then took a closer look at the ten metrics themselves, made comments and suggestions on each, and reached consensus on the basic structure and content of all metrics categories.

Some comments and input included:

1. “Know Your Rights” is missing from the indicators
2. Enrollment *and* disenrollment in benefits can be counted as successes depending on the path of the individual
3. Earned Income Tax Credit and CALFresh participation should be considered as indicators
4. The field will have to exercise caution and respect for privacy in implementation of Credentials metrics, which requires careful, strategic communication re: individuals’ residency status

Another subset of comments consisted of questions and concerns centered on data collection methods and processes; however, at this time the charge of the group focuses on the metrics themselves and not the means of measuring them, which will be identified at later stages. EL-Civics COAPPs data as reported through TOPSPRO Enterprise will clearly be an integral part of the future overall data collection strategy, yet the current system is not designed or able to capture some of the data that may be indicated by some of the recommendations. CAEP programs and partners are serving immigrants in all programs and in many different forms, so metrics and data collection must go well beyond the current ESL/EL-Civics/Adult School context to be comprehensive.

Carolyn shared an analysis of the recommendations, identifying Recommendations 3 and 5 as most central to the narrower task of AB2098 and Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 as more aligned with the broader scope of the legislation. She also pointed out that CAEP is not positioned to collect data from non-adult school or non-WIOA agencies. PRIISM (acronym for the working

name of the idea for delivering multi-agency/cross-agency services: Portable and Replicable Immigrant Integration Services Model) is an example of a broader scope recommendation because it is meant to be universal and therefore not in the exclusive purview of CAEP.

Next Steps

After the meeting, the CAEP Leadership authorized an additional meeting to be held on June 7 to carry out the following:

- Move the current draft recommendations closer to near-final form
- Review the work of the two subgroups (EL Civics Enhancement and Non-ESL Options)
- Continue to prioritize and add detail to the indicators
- Discuss data collection tools and methods, including expanded use of EL Civics right away and incentivizing such use
- Develop timelines for implementation

The Work Group agreed that two subgroups should address Toolkit-related tasks and report results at the next meeting, as follows:

Group #1: EL Civics Enhancement Group

Members: Liza Becker, Laura Chardiet, Bob Harper, Jennifer Hernandez, Janeth Manjarrez

Charge Points:

- Expand EL Civics
- Increase rigor
- Assess the 10 immigrant integration areas to identify areas of congruence and gaps
- Address data capture options for all CAEP agencies (WIOA/Non- WIOA; adult school, community college, COE, etc.)
- Make recommendations regarding prioritization of Co-AAPs to achieve coverage/comprehensiveness of immigrant integration goals
- Promote flexibility in delivery
- Identify quick-win options for extending EL Civics to non-English Learner immigrants

Group #2: Non-ESL Options Group

Members: Laura Chardiet, Sofia Ramirez Gelpi, Jennifer Hernandez, Janeth Manjarrez, Margie McHugh, John Werner

Charge Points:

- Explore metrics (and practices) to serve non-English Learner CAEP students, especially Generation 1.5 students and immigrant students in ABE/ASE and CTE

- Assess options to participate in the applied (non-ESL) aspects of EL Civics
- Consider alternative delivery methods
- Address the need to undertake an individual assessment of what students want/need
- Consider options for giving credit for prior accomplishments
- Look at the census as an opportunity to demonstrate EL Civics for non-ELs
- Address how immigrant integration services are best marketed to non-ELs
- Assess potential issues related to how generation 1.5 will be affected by the transfer Math and English elements of AB 705 (e.g., the possibility that they won't have the requisite academic language skills to pass 1A; the risk of "reverse referral" to adult education, etc.)