

Work Group Meeting Record

Advisory Council

X Work Group: Program Standards

Meeting #: 2

Date: 03/12/08

Members in Attendance: Dave Banno, Tom Larrabee, Nancy Fritz, Mary Lou Gentz, Janet Isserlis, Kathleen Knight, William Morrisette, Katherine Meyer, Amanda Raitano, Karisa Tashjian, Michele Rajotte, Johan Uvin, Debbie Anthes

Chair(s)/Co-Chairs: Nancy Fritz, Janet Isserlis

TOPICS AND DELIVERABLES

Topics	Related Deliverable	Related Timeline
1. Welcome	Introduction of group members	Immediate
2. Co-chair welcome	Announcement of co-chair	Immediate
3. Nomination of 2 nd Co-chair	Selection of 2 nd co-chair	Immediate
4. Note Taking Assignment	Request for volunteer to take meeting notes	Immediate
5. Re-cap Meeting #1	Review notes of prior meeting	Immediate
6. Discussion	Clarify purpose/rationale for program standards and its relationship to PBF	Immediate
7. Homework assignments	Members were to read Adult Literacy Taskforce's "Building Critical Links" and USDOE's Performance Based Funding for AE guide	
8. Identification of Key Performance and Quality Standards Candidates	Examine 3-5 current program standards in terms of what we know from research, be prepared for discussion	By end of next meeting (April 1)
9. Next Steps	Identify a limited set of measurements (i.e., 12) that are research-based	Mid-late April 2008
10. Feedback & Closure		
11. Next meeting date	Wednesday, April 1 1:30 – 3:00 pm	N/A

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of Work Group introduced themselves by name and agency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Co-Chair Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nancy Fritz of the Genesis Center was identified as the group's co-chair.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nomination of 2nd Co-chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Janet Isserlis of the PDC volunteered to serve as 2nd co-chair.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Note taking assignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kathleen Knight of the PHA volunteered to take notes during the meeting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recap Meeting #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members received notes from prior meeting. Handout included an outline of the Program

Standards Workgroup responsibilities and deliverables as well as including catalyst documents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members asked more clarification questions. There is already a set of Program Standards in place. They need to be examined, discussed, revised and expanded upon (as necessary). - Purpose and rationale for Program Standards was discussed. Reasoning is manifold (1) facilitates communication, (2) promotes effective practices, (3) provides criteria for self-assessment which is useful for class/program/organizational development, (4) promotes accountability, and (5) provides a sound foundation for outcome-based funding - Groups task is articulated as “what do we want to measure?” and “how specifically do we want to do that?” bearing in mind the burden of documentation (i.e., qualitative vs. quantitative standards). - Concerns over how Performance-based funds would be parsed out in the program year were raised. The anticipated method would be to divide awarded funds in thirds and issue accordingly: (1) The first third would be issued immediately as <i>base</i>, (2) the second third would be released (most likely immediately) based on compliance with <i>quality</i> measures, and (3) final third would be <i>reimbursement based on program’s outcomes</i>. This would incentivize the system as the first 2/3 would logically enable the final 3rd to be attainable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of Key Performance and Quality Standards Candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group selected one standard to analyze and discuss: Enrollment. The three tiers are Green light: 90%-125%; (it was noted that the measures now do not take into account the responsiveness of the agency to community need, any attempt at innovation and/or any attempt at measuring effectiveness. Does participation in adult ed. impact the skills of participants?) Yellow light: 60-90%, Red light <60%. Enrollment numbers are examined in terms of responsiveness (to local need), program innovation and effectiveness in delivery of services. Group will be examining more program standards in this way in future meetings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members asked to look at 3-4 standards to discuss in the next meeting, at which time we’ll attempt to decide which 4 or 5 we believe to be most important and collectively determine priorities of the group/ for the field. - Read pages 23-31 in “Building Critical Links” and look at the Maine (distributed at mtg) and Kansas models for program standards: Indicators of a Quality Adult Education Program http://www.kansasregents.org/download/adultEd/indicatorsFY05.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None was elicited formally or explicitly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Consensus (Yes/No)	Lists Multiple Points of View
Nancy Fritz to serve as Co-chair	Yes	
Janet Isserlis to serve as 2 nd Co-chair	Yes	

Next Meeting Date: April 1, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. in Cranston at Cranston Alternate Education

Reflection/Evaluation: No specific feedback was elicited.