I. Spending AEBG Dollars
   a. What qualifies as Instructional, Student Support, and Administrative Costs?
      i. Instructional is anything that hits the classroom
      ii. Student support is non classroom needs that support students (transition specialists, counselors, etc.)
      iii. Administrative is Office and Overhead
      iv. Definition of AEBG student is inconsistent and needs to be clarified statewide.
      v. Instructional areas, ESL, GED, entry/reentry, digital literacy
      vi. Instructional: Touches student in the classroom. (Examples include teachers, aides, textbooks, software, computers and equipment in classrooms, furniture, facilities and equipment, professional development related to course development or instruction)
      vii. Childcare, counseling, orientation, job search, transportation, signage as a support for students to find their way to programs---in annual consortium plan
      viii. Student Support: Counseling and Guidance Services to support AEBG students in courses and in transitioning from AE classrooms to post-secondary education and training or work. (Examples include counselors, career specialist, transportation, childcare, field trips, career exploration software, etc.)
     ix. How many hours actually equal instruction costs---define workshop vs class
     x. Define ESL for socialization vs for integration outcomes----AEBG vs enrichment
     xi. COE states 70% must be for job skills---define a %
     xii. Efficient use of funds should mean more students served with better results
     xiii. Within the definition, K12 needs should be allowed more latitude as this is the only source of funding
     xiv. Anything related to instruction including equipment should be considered instructional cost
xv. CTE: Specific pathways

xvi. Entry/Reentry leading to Job Readiness Skills

xvii. Parent/Child success and digital literacy for parents

xviii. Salaries/Staff, materials, IT (computers), P.D., counseling, transportation, child care, field trips, advertising/marketing, indirect costs (5%-10%)

xix. Administrative Costs: We believe that there is a real need for more clarification about administrative costs, which are by legislation limited to 5%. With direction from CCCCOC and CDE, the field has interpreted this to mean participating agencies’ indirect costs. Therefore, other administrative costs—classified support staff other than aides, software for registration, custodial, principals, or assistant principals, catalog publishing costs, etc.—need to be charged to either instruction or support services. Facility fees/maintenance fees

xx. District charging rental or indirect costs?

b. What expenditures would be acceptable and unacceptable?
   i. Community Colleges collecting AEBG funds and Community College Noncredit ADA on the same students is not acceptable.
   ii. The current 17 page “Allowable Expenses Guidelines” need to be refined.
   iii. Acceptable: indirects; unacceptable: offsetting regular costs with AEBG dollars
   iv. Any kinds of counseling that supports students in moving to the next level
   v. Admin costs—??——Are we thinking administrators, custodians—this is fuzzy—clarification needed here
   vi. Unacceptable: CE education, CE’s, outside of approved program areas, offsetting K12 costs with AEBG funds
   vii. Reentry into workforce?? Anger Management? Community Ed through jails?
   viii. Superintendent: depending on whether or not this person actually participates in consortium meetings (small districts?)
   ix. Some districts have hired auditors to audit consortium member expenses. This has been helpful. Are resource codes aligned?
   x. If fees are needed, should there be a certain percentage over costs that would be a maximum add on amount
xi. **Indirects charged twice, at district level (fiscal agent as well as at program level???)**

xii. Vetting traffic jam---CASAS Reading and Math

xiii. Consortium Funding Philosophy (at least one consortium has created this)

xiv. One district’s interpretation is that administrative cost equals indirect costs therefore fiscal agents can only charge 5%

xv. Guidance needed!!!

xvi. Questions/Questionable Expenses: Student (and staff) travel for legislative days. Where/how to report fees collected for CTE courses?

xvii. Can you pay a portion of staff members’ salaries when they are doing extra work for AEBG? (yes/no/supplanting??). Using existing staff to pick up the extra AEBG workload---justification is important---timecards being used for those working under multiple funding streams (CDE requirement?)

c. Accountability elements
   i. Enrollment rate
   ii. What is a completer? Define (# of hours, 80% of attendance????). Program completer/Class completer. **Define**
   iii. CASAS Data Portal- Persistence Reports-How we compare to other consortia in the state.
   iv. Spreadsheets kept---how many students served
   v. AEBG Table 9 report
   vi. Enrollment---participation rate---completers
   vii. Ratio or amount spent on student
   viii. Outcomes? Cost per outcome rather than amount spent on student-CASAS benchmarks=completer
   ix. Equity and access should be taken into account when looking at outcomes. Hard to make it fair across the board
   x. Encourage civic participation-influx of citizenship class participation
   xi. Creating access-marketing improvement
   xii. School community liaisons---hired positions---outreach---at high schools---collecting baseline data---re-branding, a statewide system of tracking is needed---self-reporting will no longer work
xiii. **We should all be doing the same thing** because we are all approaching needs and they are different, it’s hard. For example, # of students, increased NRS levels, WIOA, CASAS, challenges are unique so it’s hard to come to minimum performance goals. Create a baseline for each consortium

xiv. Strategies attached with outcomes.

xv. Need clarification on administrative costs limit to 5% (should this say indirect?)

xvi. Require consortia to conduct annual or bi-annual audits. One consortium hired an auditor to look at all members’ expenditures for 2015-16 to ensure that they were: aligned with the plan, aligned with the legislation and the published allowable expenditures information, and coded correctly.

xvii. When charging fees for CTE classes, establish a percentage over cost that would be the maximum charge for agencies.

xviii. Publish/Publicize fiscal question, problems and solutions

xix. Need change around the no member can receive less than it received in prior year to allow for agreed upon investment in one time or short-term program investments/expenditures. (For example, maybe one year agency A needs to buy textbooks, maybe the next year agency B needs new computers....)

xx. Internal Process/Audit Procedures/Policies

xxi. Completion rates/Jobs/Outcomes/Level Advancement, Certificates earned

II. Consortium and Member effectiveness

a. What constitutes effective consortium membership and what constitutes ineffective consortium membership? (Is effectiveness simply the opposite of effectiveness?)
   i. Effective
      1. Member does what they say they will do and had data to demonstrate that they did.
      2. Members spend down the funds.
      3. Member regularly and meaningfully participates in all consortium meetings (regular and workgroup meetings)
      4. Defined in different ways – Developed a survey to survey all members in one consortium.
5. Driven by regional plans – achieving the plan.
6. Need to have accountability flexibility – an alternative school model – develop list of accountability measures and have the agency/consortium pick from the list and a dashboard is then developed.
7. The Consortium structure (governance, fiscal/budget, and data) is the most important connecting elements of consortia work. Workgroups for each have to work both individually and collectively to ensure member effectiveness. (Money spent down with positive student outcomes.
8. On time and complete with requirements, transparent conversations, spends allocations and reports what annual plan set out to do---outcomes as stated in plan
9. Consider consortium first, before program---how are we benefitting students?
10. Similar to alternative school accountability model
11. Self-reflection with plan---how did we do?
12. Mentoring consortium to consortium
13. Has each member spent its $$$? Consider delayed projects where funds are earmarked. Were funds spent on what was in the plan?
14. Participation in meetings, transparency, smaller programs find it harder to participate in prolonged activities

ii. Ineffective
   1. Lack of follow through
   2. Not spending the allocation (i.e., not serving students)
   3. Not meeting accountability guidelines
   4. Still doesn’t know what an AEBG student is.
   5. Support inefficiency with site visits to efficient programs
   6. Some are dealing with this issue currently---difficult conversation. First draft was deemed ‘harsh’---document will be revised soon---long time partners understand
7. Document defining ineffective member, letter sent to district superintendent with specific parameters as to how/when monies need to be returned
8. Programs can be defunded but remain members of a consortium
9. Take to AEBG Office in Sacramento

iii. Some participant drafted member expectations in governance document and also created a Memorandum of Agreement for each member district to sign annually.

iv. Effective (minimum):
   1. Active attendance at meetings
   2. Turn in data on time and complete
   3. Turn in fiscal information on time and complete; make expenditures in accordance with the plan and expend funds in a timely manner

v. Effective (nice to have):
   1. Put regional needs before individual district
   2. Maintain a balance approach to AE services across the region
   3. Use data to inform programmatic decisions

**Group is asking for a mechanism to post solutions, as we move forward.**

b. Should there be minimum performance goals such as WIOA performance goals?
   i. WIOA is not the end all. Site based leadership makes each school and community different.
   ii. CASAS table says YES!
   iii. Similar to WIOA assessment policy? Identify regional priorities
   iv. Collect student satisfaction and persistence data
   v. Hold student focus groups
   vi. Effectiveness surveys to be completed by member districts for shared staff positions
   vii. Annual retreat to review data, reflect, plan and adjust processes, structure and goals
   viii. Data elements – CASAS WIOA measures. Data portal and payment point summaries – though not all agencies are WIOA funded
ix. Consideration of collecting the SSN – SSN is the only way to data match with SSN. EDD doesn’t have other data elements needed for a fuzzy data match.

x. Consider both self-reported data and data match.

xi. Minimum performance goals---should there be some? Yes!

xii. Group discussed other performance goals that should be looked at. For example, some of the immigrant integration outcomes, like whether or not someone gets a driver’s license (How do these compare to ESL Civics outcomes?)

xiii. Create the ability for local regions to recognize their own certificates. Important to recognize locally created certificates that are known to be effective in helping students to find employment (especially, in the area of entrepreneurship)

xiv. Flexible performance standards---maybe a list of possibilities an agency could choose from depending upon areas of focus (talked about a continuum so that agencies are moving toward the same overall outcomes, but may depend upon where they are---or how long they’ve been implementing certain programs)

xv. Identify top priority in your region. Retreats are needed for more intensive conversation.

xvi. Alternative schools – select three that your area will focus on.

c. How is an evaluation of your consortium work and performance this year informing your consortium plan for next year?
   i. One consortium holds a two-day summit of all stakeholders to review annual progress and develop the new annual plan.

d. More annual planning, retreats, time away from agency to ‘deep think’

e. Annual planning meetings should include school data review

f. **Member Participation Agreement**---harsh? Consortia looking at changing their agreements with definitions and more clarification on participation---to prove effectiveness/ineffectiveness. Written protocol created when faced with this dilemma. Deadlines...be careful of burning bridges.

g. Governance plan needs to be clear
III. Consortium and member effectiveness supports and/or interventions...
   a. What kind of support(s) and/or intervention(s) might be provided if a member’s work and/or outcomes are deemed “ineffective”?
      i. Site visits
      ii. Sharing staff expertise (TOPSPro Enterprise, CASAS, ASAP)
      iii. Need help in how to support students who are in and out of programs quickly (specifically jail programs)
      iv. Share information on potential staff and staffing needs across the consortium.
      v. Fiscal efficiency, level funding across the year?
      vi. Cost per student/cost per outcome---ratios
      vii. Increased attendance
      viii. Equity and access issues---some populations require more intervention---how can this be evaluated fairly?
      ix. Baseline for each consortium member and allowing them to be measured against themselves, not each other
      x. More specificity in next three-year plan
      xi. Clear expectations outlined by members---governance plan
      xii. Consortia need clear expectations outlined by members in governance documents (governance template and/or MOA). These should define expectations, performance measures and process to ensure all members participate fully. Then members need to follow the process. It’s easier to have these conversations BEFORE there’s a problem. There are several models around the state that could be shared
      xiii. CDE and/or Adult Ed districts helping other Adult Ed districts by shadowing, providing support, communication, scheduling
      xiv. CDE and Chancellor’s Office should provide member support
   b. What might be next steps if support(s) and/or intervention(s) don’t help?
      i. When interventions are not effective after concerted attempts, pull the money
      ii. Targeted technical assistance
      iii. Finding primary ‘stick’
      iv. Focus on students not money
      v. Create relationship before talking about money
vi. Don’t wait to escalate—smaller conversations
vii. Suggest that we implement a mentor program where effective consortia or members mentor consortia or members who are struggling in particular areas. Maybe identify areas of “competence” for consortia to provide targeted technical assistance
viii. Next steps: Consortia follow whatever is described in governance plan – and the governance plan should describe the agreed upon process and consequences the members will follow when a member does not perform. All agreed that reduction or loss in funding is an appropriate response when members don’t perform after intervention

IV. Regional and Community-Based Collaborations
   a. What have been some effective strategies you have used to build strong collaboration with your local Workforce Development Boards?
      i. Included the Workforce Development Board as a partner in the consortium since the outset.
      ii. Ditto above
      iii. Super region meetings
      iv. CalWORKs involvement
      v. Regional work to create WIOA and Strong Workforce
      vi. Include the WDB in consortium or super-region meetings
      vii. Using regional CalWORKs discussions as a way to involve WDB (and HHSA) in regional planning process
      viii. Using regional work for WDB to create regional plan for WIOA and the Community Colleges to create their Strong Workforce plan as a way to talk about the Ad Ed regional plans
      ix. Advisory committee, board member, talk with them, invite to meetings
      x. Challenge has been the change in personnel for WDB
   b. What have been some effective strategies you have used to build strong collaboration with your local Community Based Organizations?
      i. CBO receiving funds from the consortium using an RFA process.
      ii. Included CBOs on all subcommittees.
      iii. Regional summits
      iv. Job Corps
v. Consortium funding to continue HSE at libraries
vi. Focus on the paths
vii. AEBG summits should include ALL who want to participate
viii. Shared partner meetings with our super region
ix. Regional community summits within consortia or as super regions
x. Involvement of Job Corps
xi. One consortium shared that it is funding the public library to continue its high school diploma program
xii. Challenges: tight timelines to submit plans have in some cases prevented authentic collaboration – and instead have focused on completing task at hand
xiii. AEBG Summit should allow for more participants, so that ALL who want to attend can. Since the size of regions and number of members vary from region to region, equal (every consortium can bring four representatives) is not equitable
xiv. Same as with Workforce Development Board

V. How do you want next year’s AEBG Regional Meetings to be: Conducted? Where? When? What Topics?
   a. Do a survey of all CCAE/CAAEA members in Central and Northern California.
   b. Rotate locations
   c. Tack onto other meetings (this year the CCAE conference didn’t work out like it could have – with Thursday begin the Executive and State Board meetings, it created a down day for region members who are not involved with the board) Could the Board meetings occur AFTER the conference?
   d. Publish dates very early in the year so people can count on them. Some of the dates were announced very close to the event.
   e. More electronic collaboration
   f. Suggest that CCAE survey membership about how to structure the meetings and about viable topics