Program Review Committee Meeting

WCF Admin Office 707 Mendham Blvd., Suite 250 Orlando, FL 32825 Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:00 a.m.

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Sanford Shugart, Dr. Angela Adams (via phone), Greg Beliveau (via phone)

Paul Bough, Wendy Brandon, Brian Michaels (via phone), Eric Ushkowitz (via

phone), and Larry Walter (via phone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steve Clelland, Tirso Moreno and Richard Sweat

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin Neal, Pam Nabors, Joyce Hinton, Homer Boone, David Lowell, Leo

Alvarez, Tonya Elliott, Anika Holmes, Nicole Jacone, and Kaz Kasal

GUESTS PRESENT: Max Ketterman/Commission for Independent Education (via phone)

WELCOME & CHAIR'S REMARKS

Welcome

Dr. Shugart called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and welcomed those in attendance.

Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

Ms. Kasal commenced with roll call and established that there was a quorum present.

Public Comment

None offered.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM 8/27/13

Mr. Walter noted that a correction needed to be made on the first page of the minutes in the heading section from 2:00am to 2:30pm.

Mr. Walter made a motion to approve minutes from the 8/27/13 meeting, to include the above referenced correction. Mr. Beliveau seconded, motion passed.

TRAINING PROVIDER WORKSHOP

Dr. Shugart stated that the bulk of today's meeting is to begin the dialogue, in a workshop format, to review eligibility criteria and discuss/gain input from training providers on changes in the application process. Dr. Shugart asked all attendees to introduce themselves.

After introductions were made, Dr. Shugart asked the WCF staff to provide their Powerpoint presentation.

Mr. Neal greeted the attendees and provided a timeline overview of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) since its inception in 1998. Mr. Lowell provided an overview of current policy requirements and the application process for training providers from online application to site inspection and then board approval. Mr. Neal

Program Review Committee Meeting October 29, 2013 Page 2

reviewed the new requirements from the Department of Economic Opportunity's latest guidelines. The primary purpose of the new guidelines is to identify training providers that are initially, automatically eligible from those that are not. Training providers are divided into three categories:

Category 1: postsecondary educational institutions that are eligible to receive federal funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act and provide a program that leads to an associate degree, baccalaureate degree or certificate

Category 2: entities that carry out programs under the National Apprenticeship Act

Category 3: other public/private providers of training services – entities not meeting the requirements of categories 1 and 2.

Mr. Neal indicated it is the third category that feedback is needed. The board has flexibility to create local criteria. Mr. Neal also reviewed the two-stage eligibility process: initial eligibility and subsequent eligibility which includes an annual review of: accreditation/licensure maintenance, timely reporting of student data, programs linked to local targeted occupations list, minimum levels of performance are met, and program cost information is updated. Additional resources: Florida Department of Education/Commission for Independent Education (CIE) – types of institutions under jurisdiction of CIE; and the Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) – entities are required to report student data

Mr. Ketterman stated that their commission (Commission for Independent Education/CIE), as part of their licensure process, visits every institution for an on-site evaluation every 2 to 3 years. It is the policy of workforce development/DEO that all providers are required to be licensed and are subject to annual review (performance and cost). Mr. Ketterman stated that CIE evaluates each training provider in great detail and monitors on a regular basis. Also the training providers must offer programs listed on the local Targeted Occupations List (TOL). Dr. Shugart commented unless WCF's criteria is different from CIE's, we should consider theirs to avoid duplication. A training providers suggested that as part of the eligibility process, WCF could obtain a copy of the letter and review checklist that training providers receive from CIE, as part of their verification of licensure with CIE. The checklist lists violations, if there are any.

Mr. Ketterman stated that all training providers participate in FETPIP by submitting data through CIE – this data is student identifiable (name, social security number, training information) and the FETPIP site is secure for storage of this data. However, there is an 18 month delay before FETPIP data outcome reports are received. Dr. Shugart commented that these reports are useful for long term policy decisions, but not on a term-by-term basis. Mr. Ketterman stated that CIE looks at the training provider student files and employment documentation during their audits to validate what was submitted. Mr. Neal stated that case managers keep up with students that are enrolled.

CHAIR'S CLOSING REMARKS:

Dr. Shugart stated that discussions will continue on this – there is no immediate deadline; so review/analysis can continue until before the end of the program year, 6/30/14. The aim is to simplify/strengthen processes and avoid duplication. Some larger questions for training providers to weigh-in on are: 1) programs with no two year history – what to do with this, 2) completion/credential vs. placement – are both important or is placement enough and 3) connecting what students pay for tuition vs. what they are earning. Based on provider feedback today it seems training providers are not resistant to simplifying processes and annual data collection from various sources to strengthen data. Mr. Neal stated a point of clarification – CIE used 70% placement rate and outcomes; board adopted this eligibility criteria for continuing approval as a training

Program Review Committee Meeting October 29, 2013 Page 3

provider.

Dr. Shugart thanked those who attended today's meeting.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 11:33 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaz Kasal Sr. Administrative Assistant Administrative Assistant