

**GOVERNOR'S WORKFORCE BOARD RI  
ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Office of Higher Education, Providence, RI  
June 18, 2007  
MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present: Jack Warner, Joseph MarcAurele, Mario Bueno, Robert Nangle, and George Nee  
Members Absent: Armeather Gibbs, Robert Paniccia  
Others Present: Johan Uvin  
Board Staff Present: Michael Koback, Stephen Schaefer, Nancy Olson, David Francis, and Maureen Mooney

With a quorum present, Chair J. Warner called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m.

A motion was entered to approve the Adult Education and Literacy Meeting Minutes of May 7, 2007.

**VOTE:** J. MarcAurele moved to approve, seconded by R. Nangle. All approved.

*Background discussion FY208-FY2010 Funding Recommendations Adult Education*

Chair J. Warner began the meeting by referring to the FY 2008- FY 2010 Funding Recommendation materials distributed as the meeting began. He acknowledged the sensitivity of the material and noted that it would be embargoed until July 10, 2007 and requested that the members honor the embargo.

Chair J. Warner mentioned that these recommendations are based on assumptions that J. Uvin and M. Koback would discuss later in the meeting. Chair J. Warner did say that by way of introduction, these recommendations were an unprecedented process for an adult education system. Initially the purpose was to consolidate all sources of funds. He referred to the FY08-FY10 funding recommendations as a presentation of a \$9 million package from all funding streams.

The methodology was a single RFP that made invisible to the bidder the disparate nature of the funds that supports Adult Education. This was part of the system design process that is intended to be a three-year process and offers more sustainability built into the system. Chair Warner noted that \$22 million in proposal requests were received in comparison to the \$9 million there is to distribute.

A large committee worked on balancing the issues of quality and access, the two main variables that went into selecting recommended providers. First was an

evaluation of quality on a 100-point scale, and each proposal was evaluated against that. The first pass yielded a ranking from top scores to the lowest scores for the proposals. If the awards were made strictly on that basis, there were very wide gaps in access around the state. One of the other principles required was that the system really needed to provide a combination of best quality and of being geographically accessible. The second pass considered the intersection of quality and access to make sure that all the providers cover the ground. Chair J. Warner then ended this general introduction of the FY2008-FY2010 recommendations.

*Funding and Recommendations:* The discussion continued to evaluate the question “do we have the mix of money needed to make all of this happen”. Chair Warner referred to J. Uvin for this analysis.

J. Uvin began this discussion of the FY 08-10 funding information by stating that staff of five agencies conducted the evaluations. He referred to the funding information included in Exhibit A: Scores, Requested Funds, and Statewide Ranking of FY 08-FY10 Applications by Agency Summary Score. He also referred to Exhibit B: FY 2008-FY2010 Adult Education Funding Recommendations.

J. Uvin proceeded to discuss the set of recommendations outlined in the packet, specifically Item #1 which endorses the list of 38 agencies (Exhibit B), which were recommended for approximately up to nine million in federal and state funding, and approval of the Job Development Fund funding for selected grants using two scenarios: (1) \$2.5 million and (2) \$4.5 million.

Chair J. Warner clarified that the \$9 million allocation in federal and state funding relies on the \$4.5 million scenario. He further clarified that without this funding the recommendations would have to be cut.

J. Uvin noted that there is a disclaimer that contingent upon any un- anticipated changes funded with federal and state allocations, there may not be funding of all the awards at least not at the levels recommended.

J. Uvin also highlighted some of the other recommendations in addition to the list of agencies (already mentioned). He specifically mentioned Item #2, which states that in the event no agreement can be reached when attaching conditions to a grant, the funding will be reallocated to the next competitive application. He noted that if there were no subsequent competitive application, then the monies would be distributed among other providers in the region.

R. Nangle raised the point that if the next competitive bid involved more money being allocated, that it should be negotiated to stay within the budget. J. Uvin responded that with all of these grants, the current budget would be negotiated when going to the next competitive application.

J. Uvin further reflected on and discussed items #3 through #10 of the FY 2008-FY2010 Funding Recommendations. Specifically J. Uvin asked for the committee's support by referencing Item #9 which creates, with the support of the Office of Adult Education, 10-12 networks by the end of FY09 to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of adult education services (currently 38 entities).

*Discussion of Funding Recommendation Items:*

J. Uvin asked for questions. J. MarcAurele stated there is an issue since we do not know the total funding source yet and that the numbers issued in the report are still in jeopardy. Dr. Uvin said the funding is not final yet, that the Senate meets on Tuesday and the final budget is expected on Friday.

J. MarcAurele asked what the anticipated reaction might be from the list of "defunded" agencies. He questioned what would happen from a practical perspective?

J. Uvin acknowledged disappointment would occur on the part of de-funded agencies but that they would be afforded another opportunity to request funding at another point in time. J. Uvin stated that he was confident that this process was conducted in a fair and rigorous manner.

G. Nee asked about a formal appeals process. J. Uvin responded that he believed there would be a two, business week timetable for any concerns. His office would review any appeal and any requiring judgment would be presented to the Workforce Cabinet.

J. MarcAurele asked M. Bueno if he had any first reaction to the appeals process mentioned. M. Bueno responded that he hoped the formal appeal process would be available to those not funded, and that he thought any denial might not be pleasant. He also replied that any individual within an organization who receives services, if that organization is at risk of closing, that student should receive benefits from another agency.

J. MarcAurele shared his perspective on non-profits in the state and how it is known that there are simply too many. It is an issue, like the state budget, of what non-profits will face in the future. He mentioned he envisions future issues if the agencies do not come together. He questions the programming of non-profits that have budgets of less than \$150,000, yet have an Executive Director and two assistants. His concern is where is the programming?

J. Uvin reiterated the importance of the 10-12 agency network structure to address this issue. He specifically mentioned the success of South County in this regard. He felt it encouraging for this model to replace the current model of the 38 separate agencies.

M. Koback reiterated J. MarcAurele's premise that system reform is necessary, that it is time to align the resources where needed within the system. He felt this is the time to do so.

Chair J. Warner voiced his concern that a specific plan be in place for students transitioning. In higher education if a school or higher education institution closes, provisions are made for record keeping and for transitioning the student. The student's interest is protected. Chair J. Warner felt this committee and the effort today is a strong endorsement to protect students' interests. He felt we are moving in the right direction.

To clarify the process, Chair J. Warner stated this group would endorse the recommendation to the upcoming GWB Strategic Investment Committee meeting.

J. MarcAurele discussed his perspective that the Adult Education piece of workforce development is the most crucial area that needs support otherwise we would be disenfranchising a whole group of employable people. He cannot think of many better things to do with the job development fund.

G. Nee asked J. Uvin if there was a common reason why agencies did not make the cut. He asked if issues such as staffing were part of the reason. He indicated he is looking for things to learn from these recommendations.

J. Uvin indicated there were two main reasons for not making the cut. For one, many agencies seem to take funding for granted because they had received funding previously. Also, though some agencies had brilliant ideas, it was not a good fit for adult education funding. M. Koback confirmed this reasoning and mentioned that with the Comprehensive Work Training Grants, 49 were not funded because they did not submit a request properly, as it appeared they expected to be funded. J. MarcAurele mentioned United Way and their current process of taking funding away from agencies that had been funded for 20-25 years. There was further general discussion of United Way and the provider community and their understanding of budgets and outcomes and future funding issues.

Chair J. Warner stating no further discussions, made a recommendation that the task team endorse Scenario 2 that assumes the \$4.5 million as the assumption for the basis for the \$9 million total. His recommendation also recognizes the fine-tuning needed within the federal and other funding streams that need to be formally endorsed.

A period of clarification and discussion ensued regarding the amount of the recommendation amount of \$4.5 million. This was discussed and verified at \$4.5 million.

Chair J. Warner motioned that the Committee endorse the \$4.2 million in recommended awards.

**VOTE:** G.Nee moved to approve, seconded by J. MarcAurele. All approved.

Dr. J. Uvin finished up the meeting by discussing several points of Section 3: Innovations of which he highlighted items regarding the Community College efforts on developmental math and reading, the Welcome Back Center planned to service highly educated foreign born professionals and Adult Education supporting career pathways as well as the other points listed in the recommendations.

Chair J. Warner recognized and commended J. Uvin and staff for the hard work regarding the Call for Investment Proposals in the area of Adult Education. He asked if any further business was to come before the committee. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn.

**VOTE:** J. MarcAurele moved to adjourn, seconded by G. Nee. All approved.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Mooney