

## Member Effectiveness Field Team Meeting notes

### Member Introductions

- Discussion regarding performance target and goal and how that will be accounted – the plan should include quantitative targets with clear consortium targets according to some team members. Some members are concerned that adult education members may be uncomfortable with metrics.
- Discussion surrounding the purpose of the ME team to encourage effectiveness not necessarily mandates and encourage a process tied to resources and performance incentives

### **Objective for today:**

- ✓ Understanding of process and product to date
- ✓ Initial input and refinement
- ✓ Next steps for sub team work
- Overall the facilitation team would like to have all the products ready by August to allow time for use of said products in the three-year planning process. The team will need to continue with frequent check-ins and communication in order to meet the August goal.
- Planning template has not been completed yet but the anticipation is that the template will be as easy to use as it has been in the past.
- The teams specific charge was to create a framework for effectiveness and although developing a crosswalk was not part of the initial task it will help with the process.
- The ME framework I not intended to remove local control but to enhance what members do well and encourage effectiveness.

### Review of the framework design principals (see framework page 1)

### Review of proposed process for consortia and members to use the indicators framework (see framework page 1)

- Although many want to identify standards as ways to hold people accountable, which is part of the goal, the overarching goal is to determine best practices and the framework provides a set of principals that could tie to other things connected to planning and fiscal management; however, the framework is not a standalone or “law” to enforce effectiveness.
- Some consortia could adopt the framework as their program review process as they evaluate if they met targets and for goal setting. The idea is that is consortia is able to master items on the framework the consortium should see improved outcomes.

- Some think the language should switch from member effectiveness (because of the threat to losing funding some might shy away from taking risks), perhaps the ME field team can look at “consortium” effectiveness in year one and then look and the members later. Suggestion to not look at individual member outcomes in the framework in the first few years and only look at consortium outcomes and consider a name change.
  - The intent is to, hopefully, can incorporate the framework into exist processes and planning.
- Review of additional references (see page 1 & 2 of framework)
  - Overview of the crosswalk (see crosswalk document)
  - Review of the table of contents for the ME framework (see framework page 3)
    - There are 5 broad indicators of effectiveness and approximately 20 measures contained in the framework.
    - Definition of adequate requested (ambiguous term) – the ME team agrees to avoid the term “adequate” because it is not clear and may cause confusion when the product goes to the field.
  - Break into sub teams
  - Subgroups report out
    - Capacity group – 1) recommendation use guidelines instead of “standards” 2) consortium effectiveness needs to be the primary focus 3) the framework should transfer into a guidebook
    - Completion and transition – 1) add another column to represent the key outcome metric/measures and another column for evidence and a third additional column for actual outcomes
    - Connection/Entry Group – No significant changes to framework requested, only small changes to verbiage.
    - Progress group (team e for excellence) – wants to encourage overarching ideas with higher benchmarks while providing guidelines and being supportive
  - Action Steps:
    - Next meeting scheduled for 7/17/18 3:30-4:30
    - Get together with sub teams to plan next work session