Minutes  
November 1, 2007 Advisory Committee on the Transfer of Adult Career Technical Programs

Attendees: Eric Fingerhut, Marilyn Troyer (representing Susan Zelman), Jon Tafel, David Burns, Ron Abrams, Roy Church, Mark Nutter, Monica Posey, Dan Evans (representing Kathy Krendl), Howard Lawson, Rick McIntosh, Sherry Minton, Chris Pfister, Roscoe Schlachter, Terry Thomas, Robin White

Eric Fingerhut and Marilyn Troyer welcomed the group and opened the meeting. Both spoke to the important strong bond being built between the University System of Ohio and the Department of Education. Eric noted that the work of this committee will be part of the strategic plan for higher education. It will help us to envision what the workforce system will look like in the future. We are desperately behind in providing an adult workforce that has high educational attainment and job training needed for today’s employers. We are responsible to meet the goals of the current administration; we have to do better with our adult workforce to increase their college going rate, with certificates, credentials, and degrees. Marilyn identified the great opportunity to do more than transfer programs and services. Adults in Ohio will have access to education and training this affordable, effective and grounded in high standards that are performance and outcomes based.

Eric noted a staff-level committee made up of ODE and University System staff is looking at the detailed questions regarding operational changes. Updates on the activities of the inter-agency group will be summarized and provided to this advisory committee.

I. Presentations

A. Ron Abrams and Robin White presented an overview of the Ohio Workforce Education and Training Advisory Council (OWETAC).

Discussion points included:

• Changing demographics of the aging workforce tells us what the make up will be in the future, if no changes are made
• Recommended system changes versus small incremental initiatives, which have to draw older working adults to come back while they are working.
• Transferability of credit was not working, and for the consumer, our industry is complex to navigate.
• Businesses are also not included in the loop regarding their needs.
• Challenges were defined and listed. Recommendation included:

  1) Common measures and data systems
  2) Seamless articulation and transfer
  3) State level marketing
4) Incentives for collaboration – branches, community colleges, career tech and vocational
5) Incentives for promoting services to high need students (overcoming obstacles)
6) Structural changes

Students and employers will know better about what services are available, and curriculum would be flexible and available quickly. Community Colleges and career tech centers serve over 70% of all first time postsecondary students. There would be no “wrong” door, but the front door would be better known.

B. Terry Thomas gave an overview of the Tiger Talent Team work

Discussion points included:

- Workforce and economic development are regional, not local. Important that we have to have the highest skilled workforce available.
- Average American by age 38, has 10-14 careers. There is a need for education and skills to have the tools needed for these jobs.
- Education brings opportunity, as well as increased personal income.
- Work ethic is a great selling point for the state of Ohio…but we need to have the skills behind it.
- Direction is adult friendly, regionally focused, demand driven for their mission. Their metrics and goals – flexible performance agreement- were developed with the Governor’s office. The first two relate to education, increasing adults in education pipeline, and retain high skilled, high demand workers.
- Can we increase the efficiency of the workforce assets (people, places, services) without increasing cost to increase these services?
- Need to exceed the national average increase in wage growth.
- Game changer is the workforce part of the economic development: Need to get new businesses in and to retain them.

Some goals of Tiger Team include:

- state level coordination of training assets
- new vision to increase earnings from $ 7 hour job to $ 17 hour career
- use Ohio Skills bank initiative to fill the skills gap in regions
- Make the workforce development assets work more efficiently.
- Strengthen best practices to build relationships to improve services across the state.
- Performance driven metrics to pull the workforce and economic development teams together

Governor’s workforce policy board is to change from a WIA focus, to broader state workforce development focus. Board is touchstone to the community, giving 5-10 year focus instead of only what is happening currently. The goal is to build stronger bridges between ODJFS, ODOD, OBOR more comprehensive relationships and communication sharing.

II. **Defining the Task, Developing the Strategy, Building the Momentum**
The remainder of the meeting was a high level discussion of the task, strategy and how to build momentum.

Jon Tafel noted that we need help to translate the work we are doing at the State level to what will be operationalized at the local level. There are a lot of learning opportunities for adults. How do we create equivalencies to help them at the college level? We need to find a way to “credentialize” – give credit for people coming out of the career tech centers into the higher education. We need stronger integration so we can transfer training components—especially from adult career to college. Jon is hoping that there is enough trust built up with TAGS to have the work done more locally, due to cost and logistics.

It was mentioned that the CT2 group, created from HB66 to match up the career tech system with Community Colleges, is a valuable effort and there was a need to keep this moving. Right now the outcomes from this group are coming too slowly and there may be need to speed these efforts up.

Eric mentioned that the Articulation & Transfer is the cornerstone of the future of a more seamless pipeline for the future. How can we make this a more friendly system?

Comments made from various council members included:

- Regarding education and training of adults outside of higher education - if we could find it, certify it, and package it, we could market this along with them. How do we partner with these companies, to get their learning into our pipeline?
- The OITP program’s decline and how the past support and integration made it successful.
- How can we work more closely together, quit duplicating efforts, and serve the needs of businesses. Certificates are needed to help translate what adults do to something that can help them improve their opportunities. We can’t afford to leave any type of student behind. System has to be more seamless and easy to navigate.
- It was noted that we stretch our thinking that the customer is the student and that ODDO focuses on the business. Part of the conceptual challenge is serving both the employer and the employee. Best way to get to the customer, will be through the business. Business might be the more efficient way to reach potential students.

David Burns asked for feedback from the template. Observations included:

- Template was mostly learner/student focused and did not represent business needs. Where is the incumbent workforce in the vision wording? (e.g., skills advancement, career advancement, etc.)
- Template should continue to encompass idea that a large adult population is underprepared (no GED, in ABLE program, etc.) and that they need to be considered, as they are not currently in the postsecondary pipeline.
- Suggestion for the Carnegie unit paradigm, like in the A & T process. This paradigm is better equated to learning outcomes. What is the unit of learning we want to certify, to create the level of equivalences that we want to have happen?
• Concern about the incumbent worker’s role, and the need to position them to improve their skills. Lifelong learning has to be the norm.
• A big element in our work will be equivalency for learning – non-credit to credit. Portability of credit from one system to another needs its own bullet point.

As discussion continued, a representative asked who will be the reader of our vision. Jon said it would be a key in our strategic plan. Further discussion points included:

• How can we phrase “all adult learning” experiences? We should not use postsecondary in our lead statement as postsecondary could mean a level of content, or a level of institution. We can include certificates, credentials, and all learning experiences. Best idea to put all learning experiences together.
• It was noted that a goal is for all adult Ohioans to know what services are available. We have to help them become more intuitive to get to the right person, at the right time, and in the right place. We need to use marketing as a strategy rather than how do we become more integrated into their life.
• Discussion then centered on the 230,000 students we need to bring into our system. Who are they? Not all of these students will come from high school graduates seeking to go right into college. Some will be in the workforces, some will have completed some college, some will have degrees and need lifelong learning, and some might be senior citizens. How do we articulate them together? Can we create a pathway for each an every program?

Comments included:

• It was suggested that we not adopt the OWETAC recommendations, but re-think how we are focusing on the adults in the pipeline. Two dimensions those who are currently working to improve, and those who have stopped in out in the workforce arena.
• It was noted that we really need to agree on the core principles so that when we have points of disagreement, we can come back to the principles to hold each other accountable.
• It was suggested that we maintain and attract 21st century employers, and that this should be in the vision statement. In addition, we should only have 4 or 5 principles and then include additional thoughts in goals and strategies.
• It was asked if the Key Decision Points are the right ones. It was suggested that a better alignment of funding is needed. Colleges need to integrate ABLE into their institutions. Perhaps if ABLE moved into the community colleges it could do more of the remediation.

Structure elements were identified:

• High standards, quality instruction, support of adult learners
• Alignment of assets
• Students need to be aware of and have access to the training and education
• How is this driving the economy? It should be demand driven. It isn’t enough to teach them and have them not succeed. This idea is centered on the needs of employers and the prosperity of both employees and employers.

Next steps:

• It was suggested that the group meet monthly, have some small committee work in between. We will breakdown the components to have people working in smaller groups. Perhaps we can respond to areas we are interested in. Need 3-4 person teams to work through ideas and recommendations.
• David asks if the rural areas are all sufficiently represented, and to give feedback. We can do video conferencing if needed.
• It was suggested that there be communication beyond this group and that a website be established to give information out.
• Jon Tafel is looking to bring in people from Kentucky or Illinois who recently made similar transitions. We can look for can bring best practices from these other states.
• It was suggested to have a briefing from Stackables/Accelerate Ohio team.
• Updates and questions from the interagency team
• Lastly, to consider a business/industry employer forum to know if the system will meet their needs.

Next Meeting: December 6