

**WIOA EPTL Course Approval Subgroup Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, March 16, 2015**

<b><u>Attendees</u></b>			
Steve Trueman	<a href="mailto:strueman@rebhc.org">strueman@rebhc.org</a>	Gene White	<a href="mailto:gwhite@commcorp.org">gwhite@commcorp.org</a>
Dave Bassett	<a href="mailto:dave.bassett.jcs@cityofboston.gov">dave.bassett.jcs@cityofboston.gov</a>	Les Abramowitz	<a href="mailto:labramowitz@detma.org">labramowitz@detma.org</a>
Richard Goldberg	<a href="mailto:richard@aaca-boston.gov">richard@aaca-boston.gov</a>	Christopher Quan	<a href="mailto:cquan@detma.org">cquan@detma.org</a>
Peter Farkas	<a href="mailto:pfarkas@mnreb.org">pfarkas@mnreb.org</a>	Steve Sullivan	<a href="mailto:SULLIVANSR@MCCEO.MASS.EDU">SULLIVANSR@MCCEO.MASS.EDU</a>
Patricia McManus	<a href="mailto:pmcmanus@detma.org">pmcmanus@detma.org</a>		
John Oliveira	<a href="mailto:john.oliveira@massmail.state.ma.us">john.oliveira@massmail.state.ma.us</a>		

I. Introductions – Representatives from State agencies and Local groups came together in order discuss the Course approval process for the ETPL.

II. Review of the WIOA Law Sec. 122 compared to WIA.

Discussed State Criteria:

**Performance of Training Providers:** Recommend maintaining State minimum performance at;

- 70% Completion Rate
- 60% Entered employment rate
- Minimum wage for placement wage

Performance would be based on provider-reported data for all students.

Local areas can set more stringent criteria for local approval. Local areas can set higher standards on the three measures and/or use additional measures, e.g., performance for subset of students funded by WIOA.

**In-Demand Occupations:** Listed as a state criteria. Group was unsure how/or if the state would make this determination. Discussed possibly linking Targeted occupation for course with Mass CIS. Recommend leaving "In-demand" determination to local area review.

**Requirements for State licensing of training providers:**

Group operated under the assumption that the Training Provider Validation would occur at the state level. Local review would only take place for courses of vendors that have been validated.

Question was asked about accessibility of vendors. (i.e. ADA compliant, accommodations) Is this addressed in validation process or through contractual language at the local level?

### **Industry Recognized Certifications**

Group discussed definition of Industry Recognized Certification. TEGL from DOL was referenced. WIOA talks about encouraging providers to use Industry Recognized Certifications. Not sure how state would make determination for every course. Recommendation to make description of License/Certification a required field in training pro for those that check off that course results in one. Local area review will need to encompass review of this.

### **Initial Eligibility**

Group discussed language regarding Initial Eligibility period being "for only one Fiscal year for a particular program" Recommendation was for any Initial course eligibility be granted through June 30 of the current State Fiscal year. The course would be then subject to the Subsequent Eligibility Review.

Group agreed the 30 day review period from the time the state determines Provider eligibility was appropriate.

A crystal report identifying "pending courses" would be provided to WIB's to identify courses applying for Initial Eligibility. Report may contain course specific information such as performance information for the most current completed year, Course Results (Certificate, credential, degree...)

### **Subsequent Eligibility**

With all courses synchronized to June 30 end date subsequent eligibility can occur as a point in time activity.

The law says biennial review but the group felt that was a minimum. Recommend Annual review.

Group discussed requiring vendors to update their performance information to the prior completed year to be considered. Possibly notification can be sent to current approved vendors in advance of review period.

Only those courses for providers who have been validated and whose performance meets the state minimum will be considered.

Group discussed two reports to be available to WIB's for this review:

*Provider Information:* A report that shows the courses eligible for Subsequent Eligibility Review and their self-reported performance data.

*WIA/WIOA performance data:* A report that shows the courses eligible for Subsequent Eligibility Review and their performance data with WIA/WIOA customers through the end of the prior fiscal year with wage record matches included in the Entered Employment number.

WIBS must set policies to determine how these factors will be considered when determining Subsequent Eligibility for a course.

Group felt that the automated process to extend those courses meeting the state minimum criteria should take place and that local areas would be responsible for updating records of those courses that did not meet local criteria to show expiration of their eligibility.

### III. Other items of Discussion

#### **Review of procedures when Regulations are issued**

Many of these recommendations are being made based on our interpretation of the Law. We understand that when guidance and regulations are issued by DOL that we will need to revisit these procedures to ensure compliance. For example, can we require an annual review when the Act lists a biennial review?

#### **Appeal Process**

While the appeal process was not discussed in great detail we felt that it should follow other grievance procedures that start at the local level, for course denial based on local criteria, and escalate to the state if not resolved.