ETPL Policy workgroup meeting

Date: June 28, 2022

Time: 3:00-4:00pm

Chair: Terry Wilkerson

Members: Paula Barry, Mark Burgess, Mike Conley, Lora Dhom, Carrie Folken, Shannon Hampton, Anne Hogan, Marci Johnson, Marty Johnson, Lisa Jones, Kim Kuchenbrod, Tawanna Nickens, Brian Richard, Rick Stubblefield, Nina Tangman, Whitney Thompson, Dan Weidner, Terry Wilkerson, Rory Callahan, Dan Deasy, Natasha, Brook Taylor, Yolanda Clark

Members Absent: Jon Furr, Juan Jose Gonzalez, Jim Knauf, Megan Knight, Marisa Lewis, Emily Rusca, Patti Schnoor

Staff: Sarah Blalock, Molly Cook

Meeting Goals:

1. Discuss past work and homework regarding the ETPL
2. View a ProPath Demonstration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Item | Presenter |
| 3:00pm | Welcome and Meeting Overview  Terry Wilkerson reviewed the priorities of the workgroup, including:   1. Revise the current ETPL Policy based on TEGLs released by the DOL 2. Assue the ETPL policy follows DOL findings 3. Provide a revised policy for approval by the IWIB Executive Committee in September 2022 4. Address the Pending Equity Task Force Recommendations | Terry Wilkerson |
| 3:05pm | Recap of May Meeting, Workgroup Timeline and Roles   * The May meeting focused on priority 2: ‘assure the ETPL policy follows DOL findings’   1: Creation, Maintenance and Dissemination of ETPL  2: RAP Automatic Eligibility  3: Eligibility Requirements  4: Verficiation of Accuracy and Ongoing Eligibility   * Sarah Blalock reviewed today’s focus: dissemination.   Sarah Blalock also reviewed workgroups –   1. Policy Writing Workgroup 2. ProPath Review Workgroup   Sarah Blalock reviewed immediate deliverables of the ETPL Policy Workgroup based on DOL findings and the Equity Task Force. Sarah also reviewed long term deliverables from the workgrup based on DOL findings and the equity task force. These deliverables can be found in the meeting PowerPoint. | Sarah Blalock |
| 3:10pm | Review Homework Responses  Terry Wilkerson reminded the group of the homework questions from the May meeting, including:   * How does your local board manage the ETPL process? * How can the State determine whether the provider submitted accurate information and what enforcement actions are being taken if necessary? * What can the state do to reach out to RAPs to inform them of their automatic eligibility on the ETPL and how to indicate their interest to be on the ETPL? * Do the LWIBs have examples of what they are doing?   Terry Wilkerson noted we will put out the call to homework one more time. Rory Callahan asked if the homework questions would be resent? Sarah Blalock said yes, she will resend them.  Rory Callahan asked for clarification on the fourth bullet point. Anne Hogan noted that she had trouble too. Sarah Blalock noted that we are interested in learning how the State can verify the ETPL.  Kim Kuchenbrod noted that she would like to take these questions to AIR. Kim explained there are misconceptions regarding automatic eligibility. | Terry Wilkerson |
| 3:17pm | ProPath Overview and Discussion  Natasha Telger reviewed the ProPath search features:   * Search for approved training programs by learning opportunities (training programs), organization (training providers), credentials * Filter to narrow results by (LWIA), occupations, instructional program (CIP codes), learning delivery types and more * Find programs using map view * View high level information without going into details (cost, time, learning method) * View details for program/provider information * Compare programs using the comparison tool * All information comes from IWDS   Natasha Telger shared a demo of ProPath.  Lisa Jones asked when focus groups would happen? Natasha Telger said she would send the focus group questions out and that focus groups have been ongoing for a few years.. Lisa asked if anyone from Adult Ed looked at ProPath or Andrew Warrington from the CIC.  Anne Hogan noted that the system didn’t align with ITA requests | Natasha Telger |
|  | Lisa Jones said that we need to add occupational profiles. Natasha Telger shared occupational details on ProPath. Lisa Jones asked for the occupation section to be renamed.  Mike Conley asked will the information for ProPath continue to be scraped from IWDS, or will the information be entered directly into ProPath at some point? And will the training providers have permissions to make changes, or will changes need to be funneled through locals and/or the state? Lisa Jones noted that she wanted Manny Rodriguez and Equity Task Force members to look at ProPath. Whitney Thompson noted that because there are also many times when grant opportunities come about that cover all these costs, so if there is a way to make revisions when needed, that would be helpful. Natasha Telger explained that the changes won’t be made until the policy is updated.  Rory Callahan suggested adding an alert when critical information has been changed.  Natasha Telger described that data is suppressed if ten or less participants are in a program. Lisa Jones asked who determined the terms in ProPath.  Dan Deasy suggested that he would like to have the opportunity for our navigators work with selected adult education students to test this language, ease of use and functionality.  Sarah Blalock will compile a list of questions and provide answer to them for the group.  Questions and comments in the chat –   * Carrie Folken – what about career exploration or outlook for Illinois? * Whitney Thompson – Because there are many times when grant opportunities come about the cover all these costs, so if there is a way to make revisions when needed, that would be helpful. * Could we identify ICAPS programs within approved training providers to address needs and costs to special populations. * Anne Hogan - Will we be able to search by local area? * Mark Burgess – This isn’t replacing IWDS, it is an information match to IWDS so they should match up. There is much more in ProPath that isn’t requested in IWDS so it enhances other areas of information that IWDS cant. * Mark Burgess asked if there indication if whether a training program (learning opportunity) can be selected from occupations on the DOTL? * Mark Burgess - While we want to provide as much information as possible, we also need to be mindful, this can't do "career planner". There still needs to be local individuals working with the participant, assisting them to understand and make a final decision. * Rory Callahan - @Mike Conley, there are some limitations with IWDS, understandably, because it was designed a while ago, back before certain types of information and the level of detail we need now, we didn't necessarily need back then. So I wonder if maybe there will be an opportunity in ProPath for the screens to have editable fields, in which we could then add additional information, that is not included in the IWDS program info screens. The one area we have tricky time with sometimes, is the costs breakdowns, especially for IT training programs with a number of certifications, and it's hard to ensure that what providers are trying to charge us for our participant's credentials matches the lump sum "tests" costs fields in the IWDS training program information screen. So, being able to break down and itemize the program's cots a little more would be good. |  |
| 3:50pm | Next Steps   * Subgroup Invitations: Sarah Blalock will send out a Survey Monkey to ask for participants in the two workgroups. * Sarah Blalock will also send out draft ‘big questions’ for the review group. * Rory Callahan suggested members view the the ProPath webinar. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Los\_7UdFuqE) | Sarah Blalock |
| 4:00pm | Conclusion   * Next meeting: July 26, 2022, 3-4pm | Terry Wilkerson |