

## Eligible Training Providers

**Co-Leads: Terri Banks (DWD) and Gus Linde (Region 11)**

<b>Co-Lead: Terri Banks</b>	<b>(DWD)</b>	<a href="mailto:tbanks@dwd.in.gov">tbanks@dwd.in.gov</a>
<b>Co-Lead: Gus Linde</b>	<b>(R12)</b>	EmployIndy 317-684-2431 <a href="mailto:glinde@EmployIndy.org">glinde@EmployIndy.org</a>
Acacia St. John	(R6)	<a href="mailto:astjohn@work-one.org">astjohn@work-one.org</a>
Tracy Davis	(R3)	<a href="mailto:tdavis@neinworks.org">tdavis@neinworks.org</a>
Jackie James	(R10)	<a href="mailto:jjames@workoneregion10.com">jjames@workoneregion10.com</a>
Chris Deaton	(CTE)	<a href="mailto:cdeaton@dwd.in.gov">cdeaton@dwd.in.gov</a>
Chris Fitzgerald	(Adult Ed)	<a href="mailto:cmfitzgerald@dwd.in.gov">cmfitzgerald@dwd.in.gov</a>
Lissa Griffin	(R9)	<a href="mailto:Lissa@rivervalleyresources.com">Lissa@rivervalleyresources.com</a>
David Tucker	(Vincennes U)	<a href="mailto:DTucker@vinu.edu">DTucker@vinu.edu</a>
Brian Hamilton	(Ivy Tech)	<a href="mailto:bhamilto@ivytech.edu">bhamilto@ivytech.edu</a>

**Updates: Notes from both January 26 and February 5 are below:**

### **Eligible Training Providers (ETP) and Non-ETP Training Options WIOA Work Group January 26, 2015 Meeting Notes**

#### **Meeting Participants:**

Terri Banks (Co-Lead), Gus Linde (Co-Lead), Acacia St. John, Karen Green, Jackie James, Chris Deaton, Chris Fitzgerald, Lissa Griffin, David Tucker, Brian Hamilton, Nina Babich, Mark Hollman (note taker)

#### **First Impressions from the Group RE: WIA to WIOA Changes**

- What will the current performance based funding (WIA incentive grants) look like after July 1? WIOA allows for 10% of funds to be used, but there is more reporting required at the end of training to evaluate performance. [The finance workgroup will be making recommendations regarding pay for performance policy.]

- Currently a major challenge with INTraining is ensuring providers keep their info updated, (pricing, schedule changes, etc.). The field has to remind the providers as there are implications when a provider fails to notify of changes in a timely manner. An example given about a provider that had extended their training program but gave only one day notice of the change.
- WIOA reporting requirements were mentioned. The various reporting requirements are outlined in legislation and the work group will need to provide further research and conversation around those.
- What about reaction from the larger training provider perspective? VU and IVTCC are represented on the work group. Following are some of the comments shared with the group:
  - Keep in mind the 4 stakeholder groups – service provider, client, DWD, and tax payers.
  - Service providers want to provide demand-driven training with outcomes that benefit customers.
  - The ETPL system needs to be easier and more accessible.
  - Look at difference between academic programs and short-term training. There needs to be a deeper conversation between groups (DWD and training providers).
  - Providers are not always aware of what funding students receive or how they are performing in other academic programs. Used nursing students as an example. Need to see results.
  - Why do programs need to be approved by DWD when they already are approved by CHE and others?
  - Need to have a discussion on the heavy emphasis on industry-wide certifications. Talked about industry-recognized training, but not necessarily an industry-recognized credential. Example - Subaru/Industrial maintenance. The provider hasn't approached DWD because the training doesn't have an "industry recognized" credential attached to it. But it is a needed occupation.
  - To have a demand-driven system, we need to listen to what employers have to say.
  - Even if training doesn't have industry recognized credential, it should be paid for if it is successful.
  - Are there other businesses that would hire an individual who received the industrial maintenance training? Would they hire someone with that training alone?
  - The goal is to have an employer offer employment before participation in the training. For example, Subaru is using it now as an in-house training program but might be interested in offering the training to others.
  - Discussed the difference between credentials and certificates of completion and competency exams as added benchmarks.
  - Suggested expanding definitions of measurable as to what we want the training to do (cert/license/etc.).
  - With regard to reporting – it is hard to gather data on the academic side and sometimes on the non-credit side. Needs to be easier.
- There is a problem with the timing for approving regions to do the training and problem with requiring programs to be input by location. If they are approved for one location, why not for others (statewide)?

- Things generally go smoothly with INTraining.
- WIOA gives us opportunities to free things up a bit – to focus on career laddering for example.
- Need more of a focus on middle level skills training and incumbent training.
- How do we break down barriers without being overly bureaucratic?
- How are we impacting our front lines in the field with regard to implementation?
- How do we balance the training that’s available across industry sectors (ex. plenty of C.D.L training)?
- Do Indiana service providers use the ETPL’s in their border states?
- There is a challenge getting customers with higher skill levels the updated skills and/or certification to gain employment (reemployment).
- Traditionally the thought is that people with higher level skills will invest in themselves, but in serving those who’ve been through several layoffs, most of the time it doesn’t make sense to start them over in an entry level career.
- The INTraining list needs to build on skill sets / avoid taking customers down a whole new pathway – build on current skill set – (ex. CTorq.).
- Will look at how performance reporting is done now, what is being included, and what counts for performance. Performance criteria are outlined in WIOA legislation.
- Recommendation from the WorkIndiana side to consider including non-credentialed training on ETPL.
- Expensive programs may need to be cobbled together with various funding streams but this is tough for case managers to do. For example, Veterans programs might be on the VA eligible list and not on the ETPL list and vice versa.
- The same situation exists with VR. It’s important to communicate between the agencies assisting with training. WIOA gives us the opportunity to come up with some strategies or models for service delivery beyond ETP eligibility.
- Case managers need to be aligned with the service provider, WIB, and State. Employers will opt out if the process is too difficult.
- Front line staff is impacted - Understandability, communication, web site, etc.
- Mentioned TrackOne ITA (WIA) and 3<sup>rd</sup> party funding (Vouchers) and how we define these.

### **Expectations/Assignments for Next Meeting**

Assignments for next meeting:

- Difference between certificates of completions, certification, credentialing TEGL- how can the group clarify?
  - **Brian and David**
- ITA- voucher vs training account- other sources and giving examples
  - **Gus**

- Entry level/middle skills - what are we talking about when we talk about these levels? Where would they land? ETP or NON-ETP?
  - **Gus (Central Indiana), David (Southern Indiana)**
- What are training requirements in other States for their states eligible training provider list? Look at bordering states and can we get their policies.
  - **Acacia/Jackie, Chris —Look at specific states' policies**
- Training provider list vs. using other options- Barriers? Etc.
  - May take shape as group continues work on recommendations.

### **Save the Dates:**

Next meeting is: Thursday, February 5, 1:00 pm

Future meeting is: Thursday, February 19, 1:00 pm

All meetings – date/time/location will be placed on the WIOA shared calendar:

<http://teamup.com/ks22a32af6c8139d35/>

## **ETP Workgroup Meeting Notes February 5, 2015**

### **Meeting Participants:**

Gus Linde, Terri Banks, Acacia St. John, Karen Green, Jackie James, Jedd Vance (for Chris Deaton), Lissa Griffin, David Tucker, Brian Hamilton, Nina Babich, and Mark Hollman

### **Credentialing (Certificates of Completion, Certifications, Etc.) (Brian and David)**

- We need to establish good definitions between industry-certifications (comprehensive assessment of person's knowledge and abilities in a body of work by a credentialing agency) and certificates (acknowledgement/end product course completion). This will help with process improvement.
- Need to look at definition of professional licensure. Also at soft skills - the issue around this topic is that there is not credential around soft skills. ACT and others have assessments, but no solid credentialing piece.
- A next step could be to develop a matrix on how things fit into each category from degree to certificate of completion; to crosswalk information, examples, and further indicate the value add (how it's industry recognized, etc.).

- There was some discussion around offering college credit through prior learning assessment (pla). Vincennes already doing some of this; might take state and local WIBs pushing for it.
- Might take a look at Kentucky policy definitions, pages 10 and 11, to see if definitions match up.
- Mentioned that an employer/demand driven system might need training institutions to consider awarding credits based on employer-defined competencies.
- Need to look at training that doesn't fit in any of the categories already mentioned for example, maintenance technician – Question: might there be a sector partnership around maintenance tech?
- Might want to look at the NIMS (National Institute for Metal-Working Skills) credentialing process.

### **ITAs / Vouchers (Gus)**

- The use of the terms ITAs/vouchers are often used interchangeably and this is nationwide.
- Collectively, in his research, Gus found that WIBs do approvals at the local level and then move them up the system (whereas in Indiana they go through the State first).
- Michigan is looking at using a debit card system.
- California has a system and Gus will get information out - similar to transfer system.
- One state has a Training Enrollment Form (TEF) and they invoice off of it.
- Illinois already using the WIOA terms. A handout and links to other states were provided.
- Illinois has a more robust training provider list for customers.
- Wisconsin has a score card for training providers.
- Enhancing access to performance data will be an improvement.
- Consumers and case managers need to be reading off of the same list and getting the same information.
- There is a strategic plan in place for aligning systems (technology) for consumers and case managers.
- The current INTraining system is not capturing the performance data though the user interface is designed to display it in the performance tab.
- The data is available and being captured through INTERS, so we are in compliance with regard to collecting the data and could be ready to go in time for WIOA implementation.
- It is expected the performance information will be available on the INTraining website by March.
- Emphasized that terms around vouchers and ITA's need to consistent across the system, whether they are talked about in terms of purchase orders or a customer account that acts more like a bank account with appropriate/eligible deposits/withdrawals for education, training, and supportive services.
- Discussion around the possibility of debit cards for ITA and encrypting for certain expenditures. Is the backbone of the debit cards the State or the WIBs? The WIBs would do this. The state could do something on TAA, etc.
- Suggested using one financial institution to process debit cards for the WIBs.

- Suggested a full glossary of terms like Kentucky's policy to ensure everyone is on the same page.

### **Entry Level / Middle Level Skills**

- Credentialing matrix might help with presenting the skill level definitions.
- Gus and David will work on this more and plan to report out at the next meeting.

### **ETPLs in Other States (Acacia, Karen, Jackie)**

The Indiana policy is pretty good in terms of compliance, performance, etc.

Highlight of things that might be looked at for Indiana:

- Ohio- training approvals comes to WIB first and then the state. This helps with timeliness. In addition, regions know their providers, and can quickly define occupations in demand. Right now, Indiana is flip flopped on the process.
- Michigan includes self-employment and entrepreneurship programs on the ETPL. Its policy doesn't state if these have to be credentialed. This is mentioned repeatedly in WIOA, so Indiana might want to consider.
- In Illinois the occupation must have minimum of 25 job openings and entry wage that meets the region's average earning goals. Training provider must include three occupations for which the individual will be qualified after completing the education/training. Ex. Logistics- what are three occupations? Other discussion on this was in terms of building career pathways on occupations. C.N.A was mentioned.
- In Illinois, if one region gets a program approved, it's approved for all the regions.
- In Kentucky, programs, not providers are certified.
- Approving programs not providers is the intent of both WIA and WIOA.

### **Other discussions:**

- Discussed reciprocity between States and their training institutions. Ex. Ohio and Kentucky.
- Proprietary schools that are out of state but advertise, recruit, and enroll Indiana students must have Indiana accreditation pursuant to IC 22-4.1-21.
- Some states' ETP policies define proprietary education and cross reference the appropriate laws.
- Should Indiana look at minimum standards or more robust requirements for out of state providers?
- Though the interior part of the state does not use other states' ETPLs, border regions use some out of state providers (ex. region 10 uses Kentucky providers and region 6 uses Ohio providers).
- A key requirement for other states' lists is that the provider be in good standing with unemployment insurance taxes. This is also true for Indiana providers on the list.

### **Follow-Up and Assignments for Next Meeting:**

- Take suggestions for definition of obligations/expenditures to the Finance Work Group **(Nina)**.
- Report out on Entry Level/Middle Level skills research at the next meeting. **(Gus/Dave)**
- Report out on performance data requirements (WIOA section 116) at the next meeting **.(Chris/Jedd)**

**Next Meeting is on Thursday, February 19, 1:00 – 3:00 PM**

**Location:**

EmployIndy, 115 W. Washington Street, Suite 405S, Indianapolis, IN 46204 (Hyatt/PNC Center)

## ETP Workgroup Meeting Notes February 19, 2015

### Meeting Participants:

Gus Linde (Co-Lead), Acacia St. John (note taker), Karen Green, Jackie James, Lissa Griffin, Jedd Vance, Brian Hamilton, Nina Babich, Mark Hollman (note taker)

**Note:** See the last page of this document for ETP information from TEGE 19-14.

- ***The group will need to make a recommendation on transitioning the ETP List to 12/31/15.*** The State Board needs to be consulted on this either at their next meeting on 3/19 or at their Executive Committee meeting. Need to address the pros and cons of the transition period. The WIOA cite is Section 122(i).

### Report out on Assignments:

#### Entry Level / Middle Level Skills (Gus and Dave)

- Lots of questions regarding use of taxpayer dollars, training people with skills that meet employer demand, etc. - do we have enough programs that would fit this need?
- Middle skills definition- anything really between high school and associate degree. However, Customer flow policy states to work with entry-level.
- We should focus on the employer and customer needs. Does it lead to a credential? Does it lead to gains, employment opportunities, access to incumbent workers, or maybe a needed skill but no credential? Example – PLC - no credential, but employer needed the skills. Who is the gate keeper? Is narrowing down appropriate? Make sure we don't restrict too much – needs to make sense for moving people's skill levels.
- Region 10 is releasing a survey to employers to see what they want as far as training / employers may not want to do a certification – some employer programs don't have a credential attached.
- Sometimes the training areas are just not broad enough / employers want two or three skills
- Doing a lot with employers / not all employers want certification / some want Six Sigma, but that doesn't require credentialing.
- Sometimes it is a wait time issue / employers want the employee now and don't want to wait until training is complete.
- There seems to be a "disconnect" between employer demand and WIA credentialing and how you can spend the dollars / sometimes we have to resort to third party funds to assist.
- The Act may create an open door to training leading to credential. The Act states you don't have to bar a training provider whose program doesn't immediately provide credential when it is stacked with other training. Maybe look at career pathway.
- Do local boards have say in training provider list? Regions said "no."
- The process is being updated on approvals for training providers list. Maybe more local staff should be on the ERC? Here's the set of procedures shared in the INTraining Program Application Review: 1) check to verify that the program application is complete and accurate, 2) approve the program application for Regional Review when it meets INTraining policy requirements, 3) if approved in Regional Review, an e-mail request is sent to the provider to submit completion date and/or fill out a waiver form for that specific program(s), 4) if denied in Regional Review, the program application does not get added to INTraining, 5) when completion data is submitted and/or the waiver form is received, the program goes into an initial final review, 6) as long as the program is approved by the Region, then then the program is approved and added to INTraining.

- Need to expand the focus / right now it seems to be entry- level (Adult Education) focused / could regions have reps on the Education Review Committee? ***Nina will talk to Marie Mackintosh about this – and possibly take recommendation to SWIC with a draft revision. Also develop a recommendation as to how entry-level restrictions can be removed from Customer Flow policy.***

### **Performance Data Requirements / Update (Jedd)**

Discussion topics and related issues:

- Cited some statistics related to a significant drop in providers
- Question about process for notifying regions when programs are dropped. More than a 1000 were dropped from January to now; some of this could be program duplication clean up.
- After March, all the statistical and reporting data can be seen by all on the IN Training web site.
- The process is that the Education Review Committee (ERC) decides on who gets included on the ETPL
- Need to check on the relevant Region getting a notice – right now it probably goes to the training provider and not to the region.
- IOT does the coding for the INTraining website.
- Where is data stored once something is dropped? IOT.
- If a program drops off and it gets used by the Region, could lead to a monitoring finding / example: training started in November, in January it was dropped, would this be a problem?
- Need notification to the Field as it is usually the RO who approves training
- Important to get the info out to the training provider and to the Region – if it is just an electronic transaction, things may fall through the cracks / providers get confused on whether a program has been approved and sometimes a duplicate one is submitted.
- It was suggested to have electronic and written notification due to staff changes. Suggested more instruction for training providers on how to edit or update their information on the IN Training System. ***Jedd to discuss this with his team and IOT as well.***

How do we do other ITAs with case management system? For those programs that expand beyond standard credentials- like OJTs, training completions, etc. (reference Page 73 of WiOA. Section 122(i). How is operator going to report this information back to the State? IN Training reporting and WIB reporting? ***Nina said she will see if this could this be part of RFP for new case management mega system.***

### **Discussion / Question:**

Asked about the state occupational demand list and WIB occupational demand list. DWD is working on regional list. It was recommended that state needs to work with WIBs about what should be on the regional list. Most times, WIBs already have the list created. Maybe regions could send their lists up to the state to be included in statewide mapping?

### **Additional Research / Assignments**

- A. Subsequent Eligibility/Reasons for Removing Programs (Providers)
  - a. Why? Codes for Removal?
  - b. Regions typically don't have any input in that. Recommendation for a local voice?
- B. Determining Criteria for Transition Period through 12/2015
  - a. Note on Transition period- recommendation to SWIC for March meeting. Pros/Cons transition period. Page 73 of WOA Act. Section 122 (i). Recommendation to push it out for 6 months. Can these things be done in the time frame?
- C. Research / Requirements - Non-ETP Training Options

***There is enough information from today's meeting to draft policy to take to committees for review. Suggest just doing some email communication.***

Clarifying online application for providers. **Brian offered to have staff work on the process and tell Jedd likes/dislikes.**

WorkINDiana training approval should be made easier as well - more efficient instead of a separate document. **Could this just be incorporated into the standard online application? Jedd to review this as well.**

Schedule Next Meeting(s) – **communicate and review via email**

**Review Eligible Training Provider processes.** Review Eligible Training Provider List processes and assess how they need to be updated to reflect new eligibility criteria. Examples include: adding new procedures for the inclusion of Registered Apprenticeship programs; taking into account the need to ensure access to training throughout the state, including rural areas; and ensuring the ability of providers to provide training to individuals who are employed and individuals with barriers to employment. States must also take steps to ensure that eligible training providers are in a position to provide required outcomes information for individuals served by their programs by July 1, 2015. ETA will be providing additional technical assistance to support such implementation.