

# TRANSCRIPT: TWC AEL Business Meeting

## July 27, 2023

### NARRATOR:

---

Additional aids and services are available to individuals with disabilities. To make such a request, please contact us by email, by clicking the Help tab in the PD portal, or at [pdportal@tamu.edu](mailto:pdportal@tamu.edu), by phone, including Relay Texas, at 1-800-441-7323, or in writing, to TRAIN PD, PD Portal Support, 4477 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843.

Both a transcript and accessible document of the content presented in this webinar can be found as resources in the course description. Click on the blue links under Course Resources in the description. When a link is clicked, a new browser window will open.

### MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

All right, well good morning, everyone. I'm going to turn my camera on just for a second here and say hello to everybody. So good morning. Thanks so much for joining us today. This is going to be our adult education and literacy business meeting. For those of you that may be new, my name is Mahalia Baldini. I'm the state director, here at the Texas Workforce Commission, for the Adult Education and Literacy program.

And we try to do one of these every single year as we kick off a new year, a new program year for us, and a new round of funding that supports our programs at the local level. So if you're here and you're maybe here for the first time, today is going to be probably a little bit less content than we normally do. And I hate to say it. I might get you guys out of here early. I don't know. We had a little bit more content. I've went back and forth. I took some stuff out. I put some stuff in.

But we've got a lot happening here in the fall, as you know. We're getting ready to release our next iteration of this grant in early fall. And so we're-- there's certain things we can't say. There's certain things we can't say. So anyway, the content that we have for you today is really focused on some longer-term things and then some more immediate things for this coming program year.

Such for joining us. Folks are still trickling in. I know that we'll have some individuals that continue to trickle in as we kick things off. I'm going to go over the agenda with you very quickly

here, just so you have an idea of what we have planned for today if I can get this to work. There we go.

So we're going to start off this morning. I'm going to turn it over to Kara here, in a minute, Kara McVey, who's the grant manager for our department. And we're going to talk specifically about your amendment that you just signed back in June. And she's going to cover all the things that are new in that amendment so there's no surprises. This gives you an opportunity to ask some questions of anything that may be new language in there for you.

So we'll take a few minutes to talk about those updates and those changes that were made. And then we're going to have Elena Madrid, who's our program supervisor for Technical Assistance talk about our technical assistance plan process. Her team worked very hard on this last year, rolling this out. We had a lot of internal discussion about this. And so we want to be very transparent with what that process is so everybody knows exactly what it is. And it's really not meant to be punitive.

So she's going to walk you through that process. And that will give you an opportunity to ask any questions that you may have. And of course, as always, if there's something that we can't answer today, we'll take those questions back. And then we will present them to you in a future call. So just know if there's something that we can't answer today, we'll come back to you and make sure we can get you a response.

I did build in a break for us. We'll see how long this takes. We didn't do a run of show. So I don't know if we'll even need a break. We may be able to just power through this and get you guys out of here early. But I did build in a break.

I'm going to be talking about closing us out with a couple of things that are kind of on the horizon, but really focusing on some legislative implementation. We had a very busy legislative session. Education, in general, had a very busy legislative session. Adult ed, higher ed, and secondary education were all big, big focuses this session.

So I'm going to take a deeper dive with you on a couple of bills that were passed and ultimately signed by the governor, which means they now go into law. And we'll walk you through some of those, allow you to ask any questions. That will help me, I think, with the implementation process of this.

And then we're going to close out just talking about some things that are going to be very relevant in this coming year. We have some new NRS test. Finally. So you all probably know way more than I do, at this point, about those tests. And you're probably keeping track of those. But I want to give you the timeline from the state in terms of when we're going to roll those out and when we can expect to see those changes in our system.

We'll talk about your for program year '23-'24. We'll talk about some TEAMS updates and some TEAMS upgrades. We've got some exciting things happening there. And then last but certainly not least, we're going to end and close out with the High School Equivalency Voucher Program timeline review. So we've been working hard to make sure there's no gap there. So I'll give you an update on where we are with that.

So that being said, I just wanted to go over a couple of quick housekeeping-type things. If you have questions, you can throw them into the chat. Both the TCALL staff as well as my staff will be keeping an eye on that. We'll answer things in the chat that we can answer.

For my staff and the TCALL staff, we do have some question slides built in at the end of each section. So I'm going to ask-- Kara, Elena, myself will pause at the end of each of our sections, make sure we get as many questions answered as we can before we move on. And we'll see where the day takes us in terms of time.

Again, thank you so much for joining us. I'm going to turn it over to Kara McVey, who's going to walk us through what's new for PY '23-'24. Kara.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

Good morning, everybody. Are we ready for this 9:00 AM meeting? I know I am anyway. So let's see. So what's with the new amendment changes and updates with what you all got in July? Let's go ahead and go to the next slide, please.

OK, so in your amendments in the Attachment A's, generally we put everything that's new in bold. So these are the sections that are listed, that are in bold. We've added an SOP to your section 5.8. And it's Standard Operating Procedures. We've added an HSE subsidy program. So that's new, that you're going to have to submit to us.

5.12.8 says that digital literacy and the equity survey will now be required to determine an individual's level of experience with technology. In section 6, where it talks about our deliverables, 6.1, there has been a change to the template by removing requirements for expenditures projections and enrollment projections.

So no more do we have that big Excel file that has all of those blocks that you need to fill in and estimate and everything. We've gone from all the mathematical, technical stuff down to a more narrative-friendly version And it's also a Word file as opposed to an Excel file.

So I hope you all enjoy that. I know that the estimations were taking a lot of concern. It was a big concern for everybody because you wanted to make sure that you were all right. And there's nothing wrong with wanting to be correct.

6.5-- we updated the standard operating procedures from 7 to 8. So that's to incorporate adding in the HSE subsidy program. And number 6.20, we've added that the PD plans are due earlier in the program year. And they're no longer considered ad hoc reports like they have been for the past few years.

This has a due date of February 15 of 2023. So we want you to be submitting your PD plans at that time. You're just going to send them to the AEL contracts box like you do with all the regular deliverables. It's just now listed within the deliverables table.

Moving forward, we've got 7.1 reporting requirements for quarterly reports. This just gives you when the dates are. The dates have not changed. The reports are due in October, January, April, and July. So it's always 30 days after the quarter has ended. And next slide, please.

OK, so we've added this in-- nope, that's the wrong one. My bad. OK. 6.21 is to submit a cumulative end-of-grant report that is-- wait. Yes. Integrate report as required in section 7.3. This covers everything that's listed in the attachment A from the beginning. So they want to know a description of the project. OK, in this case, the project is the AEL program, Core Provider program. So you're just going to substitute the word AEL program for project.

This is standard boilerplate language, that is listed in all of the scopes of work for all of TWC's grants. So everything that's listed, regarding a review of the activities accomplished, project goals achieved during the grant period, obstacles encountered-- we're really wanting to know about your positive outcomes. And we definitely want to know about your best practices. We also want to hear about areas needing improvement.

And finally, for fun-- not really-- you get to give us a review of how the AEL TWC staff have managed the program. So I'm looking forward to seeing those reports at the end of the program year next year so we can see what all feedback we have from the field on what we can improve, what we can do better, what we need to work on, et cetera, et cetera. It's always good to have feedback.

Let's see. Now the items that I have bolded are things that we want you to pay special attention to because that's the information we're really, really interested in, is finding out what the activities have been that you've accomplished, what the project goals have been, what obstacles you encountered.

If it was problems in local situations or barriers to trying to get things started, we're really curious about what's going on with that. What obstacles you encountered-- we're really wanting to know about that information.

The positive outcomes-- of course, we want to know about all the positive outcomes. And best practices-- definitely want to know about best practices because that can really help with

building some capacity and making a good quality program, moving into the new RFA once it's started. Next slide, please.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Kara?

KARA MCVEY:

---

Yes?

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

There's a question. Are we going to get more info about what to include in the SOP for the HSE subsidy program?

KARA MCVEY:

---

It's going to be what's listed in-- we really don't have-- I don't have a whole lot of information on that. I think that Mahalia or Elena can-- I think Mahalia would like to speak more to that or one of the other teammates.

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yeah, I can jump in there. So for your SOP, it's all outlined in the AEL letter in terms of what the expectations are for those procedures. So we will look. And I'll actually drop the AEL letter. Or one of the staff will drop the AEL letter in the chat. But that's where you're going to go. And it's going to outline here's all the things that you have to consider when developing your SOP. So it's all there.

KARA MCVEY:

---

I see we have another question in the chat saying, "can we tell them more about the digital literacy survey?" Again I don't have a whole lot of information. I just know it exists.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yeah, I'll tackle that one too. So I'm glad somebody brought that up because I wanted to expound on it even though we haven't said a whole lot about it. I'll take this opportunity to give you guys some background information on why we're doing this, not just because it's a good idea, even though it is just a good idea.

So I've been talking with y'all for a while now, as things have been moving at the federal level, about some additional funding that will be coming to Texas through two initiatives. And one of those initiatives is called the BEAD grant. And that is the Broadband Equity Access Development grant. So these are federal dollars that are going out to the states to help to develop access to broadband services and create equity for folks in the state that maybe don't have the best connection to internet. Right?

So this is going to be a big project. Texas was just awarded \$3 billion to do that. TWC is working very closely with our Texas Broadband Office on this initiative. And there'll be more that comes out. This stuff will get developed. And obviously, I'll keep you guys informed.

The reason for the Digital Literacy Survey is because in the future, I am going to promote adult ed and our students as being folks that need access to this funding. In trying to get ahead of some things, being able to collect certain information about our students, in terms of their digital literacy from a skill perspective and the equity from an access perspective, are two big things that we'll need to do.

Now you're probably asking yourself, well, then why is there no standardized collection for this? That is going to be coming. So what we did for this year is say, hey, start thinking about this at the local level. Start including this as part of your comprehensive assessment and during your orientation processes with students.

In the future, after we've had some time to get with folks that are much more attuned to this type of work and can come up with a more standardized questionnaire that covers all the things that we feel like we need to cover to get ourselves in alignment with the state's plan for the use of these funds, then we will come back to you and say, here is the standard.

That will then go into TEAMS. And we will collect it. And once we can collect data and we can export data from the system, all of a sudden, we become a very key player, I think, in the use of those funds because we can show the need. And that's a big part of it, obviously, for eligibility of funds for these types of programs.

So that's the long reason that it's in there. The short reason is that this is coming in a much more standardized way. And this is going to give you guys an opportunity to think through that.

Once you have had this out there and you've been doing it on your own, lessons learned. So my hope is that by the end of this year, probably somewhere around the beginning of the fourth quarter, our group, we can get together.

We'll talk about some of the things that you guys put in your surveys. And then we'll talk about what the state is considering in terms of standardizing it. And then hopefully, by the end of that conversation, we'll be able to come up with something that makes a lot of sense for us as a state, to collect information on and actually track in future years.

So I know that was long winded. But that's the why behind why we're doing that. So any other questions related to that came in?

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Kara, I'm sorry. One just came in. "So we don't need to start the digital literacy survey for a AY24 students?"

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

I'm not sure what AY24 is. You will need to start it for this program year. So it's something that you guys will need to work on, come up with a survey that you can implement and add to your processes for this year. We will not standardize the language and standardize what those elements are until next year, with the new RFA. But for this year, you will need to come up with some questions related to digital literacy and equity.

KARA MCVEY:

---

OK, there's a follow-up question to that. They're asking, "so we need to go back and survey the hundreds of students we've tested since 7/1?"

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

No. I'm not going to ask you guys to do that even though this was in your grant amendment for starting for 7/1. We haven't really talked about it. And we haven't released any real guidance related to that. So no, I'm not going to ask you to go back and do that.

This is us giving you an early head start on something that will become a standardized process in the future, kind of like we did with the Career Services. We want to be able to give you an opportunity to do this before we're really requiring it, requiring it, in TEAMS and as part of a standardized process.

So no, I have no expectation that you will go back and have to do this for all of your students. It is not something that we are going to monitor for at a participant level for this year. So we're not going to go out and look in participant files.

What we may do is, during a monitoring review, ask them to collect whatever this questionnaire is, just so we know that you are compliant with your amendment and with your Attachment A. But we're not going to be putting this in as part of the monitoring review for this year at a participant level.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

We have another one. "So as long as we are gauging their self-perception of digital literacy skills, even one question during the academic advising will suffice for a quote, unquote, 'survey?'"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

If that's what you want to do, I wouldn't advise you to do that. And if it makes it easier for you guys, if y'all feel like you're going to struggle with what questions to ask, there's lots of information out there. But we're more than happy. We'll put out a letter and give you some additional guidance on what types of questions you should be asking.

And if we need to do that, we certainly can. This was just an opportunity for you guys to work with your students to figure out what questions do you need to be asking your students so that as a program, you can determine their level of digital skill so that you can determine instructional practices to be responsive to that.

And I would say the same in terms of access. It's more about how can we better serve the students and less about a compliance exercise. The part about us wanting to standardize it is just so that we can collect data in the future that tells the story of adult-ed students in the state. That's the reasoning behind us wanting to be able to standardize it in the future. Right now, it's really more so about how you can better serve your students.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

OK, we got another question. "Sorry if this was addressed already. Should we anticipate this to become an added report in TEAMS?"



## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

In the future, yes. It will not be something that we will probably pop up in there this year. But we are-- again, the goal for us is to, by the end of the year, that we have a more solid perspective of what we want to standardize for the future.

We will create the guidance that says this is what you have to include in your assessment. And then we will standardize that. And it will be put into TEAMS as part of the participants profile and as part of the comprehensive assessment. But I don't anticipate that happening in TEAMS until July 1 of 2024. But it's in the works for that deadline. Any other questions?

## KARA MCVEY:

---

I don't see any other questions yet.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

OK. That's fine. Keep them coming, guys. That's what these meetings are for, to give you guys a voice. And it also helps us to say, well, maybe we need to do more or maybe we need to be more specific in certain areas, develop guidance, things like that. So not that I have to tell you guys not to be shy because most of you aren't. But go ahead and ask those questions. That just-- that helps us. So OK, Kara. If there's no other questions, I think we can move on to Section 8.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

Cool. We had this section added to the Attachment A at last program year, since we were anticipating having the RFA out and published, et cetera, et cetera. So we left it in because we had to postpone the RFA solicitation until this year.

So what this is saying is, should-- and this is just a hypothetical situation-- if you all apply and happen to not be selected for the new RFA, this section talks about the end of grant transition between what you all have and what the new incoming grant recipient will be, taking over for your area.

This is just saying that-- just anticipation for the future. That's all this is, is just anticipation for the future of what could be. As always, it's a 50/50 chance on the RFAs and application situation. So let's go ahead and go to the next slide, please.

All right, so we've been touting this for the past program year. We've had career services listed as a supplemental category in CDER. Now since I have everybody here, I'll explain what that means. Supplemental categories do not affect the overall budget.

So if you sent an email saying, hey, I need to add X number of dollars to my Career Services budget, well, we can do all that without having to take money from another cost category because it's in the supplemental line.

That is no longer an option anymore. It is now-- Career Services now has its own cost category listed in CDER. So any money that is added to Career Services is going to have to come from another cost category. Generally, the-- actually we prefer that the budget come out of your program funds since it's the biggest pot of money.

We also have your IET training services. This is a required cost category for federal reporting. The budget due in CDER by August 15. We're requesting that you send us an AEL contracts email, saying, hey, I need to move x number of dollars into my training services. And we will get that processed for you as quickly as possible.

We also have another section, just like we did in program year three or four-- I think it was three-- for IELCE. It's your EL Civics cost category all over again. So you've got an Admin line, a Program line, a Training line, and you've also got a Career Services line listed in CDER.

Unfortunately, I do not have any screenshots that I can share with you to show what that looks like. This is normal at this point in the program year. I typically can't see anything in CDER for the new program year until August, when July reporting is due.

So anytime somebody wants to send us a budget adjustment, if it's for the new program year, I will also respond back like, hey, just wait until August. I can't get in there. I can't make any changes until at that time.

OK, so I've got two questions. One is, "so now transportation is the only supplemental reporting line?" Correct. Transportation Services, as a support service, is still listed as a supplemental. So if you want to put some money in there, you just tell me how-- tell me or Heba or whoever at AEL contracts, how much money you want to add to transportation services. And we can just add the money for you. And it doesn't affect anything else.

the IELCE is Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education. There's also another question asking if there is any other information on career services versus IET training services. I would be happy to send out, to the field, the desk aid that we got from OCTAE in their memo 17-2, that we've gone over numerous times since last year.

Basically it shows that every service that is given, except for Integrated Education and Training, is considered a career service. That's orientation. That's discussing labor market information.

That's testing. It's all sorts of activities that you all currently do on a day-to-day basis. It's just taking it from being normal program stuff and they're switching it into Career Services.

So a majority of the on-boarding process or the orientation process is considered Career Services now. I believe we're going to be working on something in the future about Career Services, give a little more information on it. But I'm not sure yet. Mahalia?

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yeah. And we have-- so I would point you to-- and if someone can from my team can find them and throw them in the chat, that would be good. We had two AEL letters that came out. One was a AEL 0123. The other one was AEL letter 0223. Both of those are related to Career Services, meaning what they are, defining them, how to enter them from both the CDER perspective as well as from the programmatic perspective.

So if you're wondering about allowable cost, that will need to go into those categories. And CDER, I highly recommend 0123. It's going to line things out for you in terms of just what is considered a Career Service cost. That's very important.

The second part is, of course, in TEAMS, designating when Career Services are occurring with individual participants. That's going to be important moving forward. And you're going to want to track the instances that that's going to happen, not just have something that's open all year round.

So anyway, I would point you to those two pieces of guidance that we've put out. We can also share the raw OCTAE memo, 17-2. It's pretty lengthy. But it can also, I think, help to maybe codify some things in y'all's minds as to why in the world do we have to report this and maybe answer some additional questions for you. So we're happy to be transparent and provide it to you. Or you can just Google it. It's out there.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

OK.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Mahalia, did you see the questions from Kim Fenton?

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

I have not. Let me move this over. Yeah.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

It's IELCE is all ELC funds or just the IET funds? Or is it regular ELC services and IET-ELC goes into the IET trainee category? Wow.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

So I believe in CDER, what you're going to see is you're going to see the IELCE as a separate cost category. And underneath that, you're going to have the same setup as you do as your-- what we're now calling combined. So you will have your combined AEL funds, which will include your federal AEFLA funds, TANF, and your state GR funds.

And then under that category, I believe you're going to have-- you're going to see an administrative cost, a program cost, a training services cost. And for that specific combined AEL, you're also going to have your corrections education and career services.

Then under your IELCE, as its own category, you will have a breakout for Program Admin, Program, IET and Career Services. So it'll be broken out and be very separate in CDER. I hope that answers Kim's question. I think it does.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

The best way to think about this is your IELCE funds, those are your AEFLA 243 funds. They're all specific to your IET EL Civics program, programmatic funds. It's the difference between AEFLA 231 and AEFLA 243. That's all we've done. We've just broken out the 243 funds from being combined over into its separate section all over again.

So don't overthink it. We've done this before. It's all good. Once you see it in CDER or once you start seeing it, it's going to be a lot easier to process. I promise.

So there's another question about, "is there a report in TEAMS for Career Services entries?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Hey, that's a great question. There isn't. But it's a good idea. And we will put that on the list. I think that would be beneficial to help you guys. So we will add that to the wish list. Thank you.

## KARA MCVEY:

---

OK. Just a little caveat. As a reminder, we cannot add or remove money within year 6 until August 1 when expenditure reports for July become available in CDER. So your year-six money is going to be a ALAF as in Foxtrot. And we will be moving forward from there. Next slide, please.

If there are any other questions, I will do my best to answer them in the chat. But I'm going to turn it back over to Mahalia. Thank you, everybody.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Thanks, Kara. Whew, you survived. Good job. All right, good questions. You guys always have good questions. So keep them coming. I'm sure you're going to have some more as we move into the second part of our meeting here, which is Elena Madrid, talking about our Adverse Action Process.

That term, adverse action, is taken directly from our rules. So that's where it comes from. But I'm going to turn it over to Elena to talk about our technical assistance and corrective action plans and what that process and tracking looks like. So Elena, take it away.

>> ELENA MADRID:

OK, so most of you are familiar with TAPs and CAPs. But for those of you who are not, I just want to simplify it enough so that you have a general understanding of the expectation for these things. A technical assistance plan is non punitive. So what does that mean? That means you're not going to be held accountable for having to pay anything back.

It's not really going to impact you when you're wanting to apply for other grants or other funding. What it really meant to do is help you to get back on track because sometimes with performance, unfortunately, we're looking for you to meet certain things, certain measures.

And when those things don't happen, we, as a state, will come in and try to identify what's going on, have us put some extra light to some things in areas of improvement And we work with you, as a grant recipient, to determine what are some good strategies for you to get back on track.

So again, this is more of a collaboration between the state and the grant recipient, in terms of coming up with what is the plan, what are the things that are identified as impacting you not meeting performance, and how can we help you to make those improvements? So that is a TAP for the most part.

A CAP, a Corrective Action Plan, will happen if after being on a TAP for a certain amount of time, there is not improvement seen. So it will generally be escalated to a CAP. In this case, a little bit different.

It can be punitive depending on what's found in your performance, what may be impacting performance. Also it affects you when you would like to apply for other streams of funding.

So for the RFA, you would have to make mention of being on a CAP. You would not qualify for other state leadership grants. That automatically disqualifies you if you want to try to apply for one. But it does not exclude you from receiving an annual workforce award. So even though you're on a CAP it will-- oh, it does. I'm sorry. It does exclude you. I apologize.

So there's a lot of things that come with the CAP. So we definitely don't want to get to that point. We want to try to work with you on a TAP. We definitely don't-- we really don't want to be on a TAP because in all actuality, that takes more time and effort, not just from the grant recipient, but also from the state team. And we're a small team to begin with.

So we try very, very hard to keep you aware of what your progress is with the monthly report cards. We provide the IE3 reports to you. Have access to TEAMS. You have access to Tableau.

So you're constantly aware of where you're at with your performance. And we try very, very hard to help you not get to that point. But if you do, we are there to work with you to figure out, OK, how do we get you on track? Next slide, please.

Basically we're looking at-- for the most part, the first criteria that would put you on a TAP is not meeting four of the seven required contract measures. Now we changed that this past year. So some of you may have gone on a TAP this past year, in '22-'23, not meeting three out of four measures.

we remove the credential attainment and also the employment attainment. Those exit measures, we took them out because we took into consideration COVID impacting those things and when those things actually get reported. So what we were looking at was your total enrollment, your IET and intensive enrollment, and MSGs. So if you weren't making three of those four, you would be eligible for a TAP.

But you could also become eligible for a TAP for other reasons. So we've had situations where there's data integrity issues, there's situations with spending. If it's a situation where there's a lot of attention being brought to that situation, good chance that you'll end up on the TAP.

So just remember that it's not just the first thing that can get you on TAP, not meeting those measures, but also, if there's a specific area that you really struggled with. So those things would qualify you for your TAP.

So I just mentioned that last year was three out of four. We may be going back to the five out of seven, which would include the employment and also credential attainment this year, just because of the changes, now that we've gone quite a distance away from the whole COVID situation. And employment and credentials should be picking up.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

It's a good time to circle back and give you what's what in terms of what was finalized, what the governor has signed, and ultimately, what that means for us, if anything. There was a lot happening in the legislative session for education in general. So for those of you that follow the legislative process very closely-- and I hope that some of you do-- there was a lot happening just in education in general, higher education, adult education, and secondary.

So the clear message to me-- and I've been saying this to you guys for several months is we've been going through the session-- is that there is a definite focus on getting Texans credentials, whether that is a high school diploma as a credential, whether that is a short-term credential, certificate, licensing. But there was a definite focus on a fast-paced track and really working on the career pathways for credentials, which is good.

That's what-- we swim in that world, many of us. So let's talk about some of the key things. Now before we get into the actual meat of these different bills, I wanted to give everybody a chance to follow along.

So I'll just real quickly-- here's a tutorial for those of you that want to pull this up on a second screen, if you have one. So step one, if you want to search for a bill, you're going to go to the [texaslegislatureonline.com](https://texaslegislatureonline.com). I refer to this and will continue to refer to this as TLO.

When you get to the Texas Legislature Online, it should look a little bit like this. Is the home page. Under the Search Legislation feature, you're going to make sure to select 88-- Regular Session 2023. That's where the bills reside, that I'm going to be talking about.

You're going to want to select the Bill Number radio button there. And then you can type in these various-- House Bill 1602, Senate Bill 2139-- into that Search feature. And it'll pull it up for you.

So once you have entered the bill that we're going to be talking about, I'm going to ask you to look at a couple of things. One is the text versions of the bill. It'll allow you to see all the different versions of the bill as it moved through the process.

And then there is a final header, which is called the Bill Stages. It's not really a header-- tab, I guess. It's called the Bill Stages-- that you can look at on each bill that was brought forward in the Texas legislature, to see if it passed and to see where it is.

We are past the point of veto right now. So even though we had a second session, we're past the point of veto for all the bills that came through the regular session. So if we had something out there that was pending, it should either be signed by the governor at this point. If it doesn't get signed, that it didn't move forward.

So again, under the Text tab, this is what's going to allow us to look at all the versions of the different bills. So you get to see how it morphed and evolved. Some of these are very lengthy. There were several versions. They can make edits to this on the floor. It can just get crazy.

But what we're always going to be looking at, to really see what was the final outcome for any bill, was the very last one, called the enrolled version. And that's the one that we'll be looking at for today's purposes. OK, so if you guys want to follow along with me, you're more than welcome to pull these up on your own. I'm going to try to do some screen sharing as well.

The first one is probably the one that is most clearly directed at our services, in particular, and of the world that we all live in, in terms of this grant. And that is House Bill 1602. And it has been signed by the governor. And it's relating to the performance criteria for the award of Adult Education and Literacy funds.

What this bill-- and I'm going to try to pull it up here-- so for House Bill 1602, there were several versions. The final version, that got approved and has been signed by the governor, reads like this. I'm going to give you guys just a few minutes to read it.

So this particular bill, there's a couple of things I wanted to just walk you through real quick because some of you may be new to the legislative process and how this works. And I want to make sure that you're well informed of how to do this on your own.

So basically, what this bill does is amend Texas statute. And it requires that TWC also develop rules in relation to that statute language. So any time you're reading something and it says Labor Code, Education Code, Administrative Code, and it has "code" in it, that means that is a Texas statute or law in Texas.

In relation to those statutes, we develop agency rules. So think of the Labor Code as that's the actual law. And then the rules are more of the implementation of how we're going to do this.

So this basically requires us to establish rules to set annual performance requirements for any entity that receives AEL dollars. And the purpose for that is that it must satisfy those performance requirements in order to qualify for a continuing award of funds.

Now they specifically go to and want us to really, when we're thinking about the development of those performance requirements, that we keep in mind that those requirements are comparable to another part of the statute, which is 315.007.



If you go to-- again, this is the statute. Our chapter and statute is 315. If you go to 315.007-- watch your eyes because I'm scrolling down here. --there is a section there that is specifically related to performance incentive funding. Now from your perspective, what does this mean?

We've already been doing this. Is your Performance Based Funding Measure A. This is the 25% have to be enrolled in an HSE or a program that leads to a credential. And then it has, the 70% of those students who exit have to earn that credential in the program year in which they exit.

Right now, this is our Performance Incentive Funding. What this actual bill does is it says, they want us to create comparable language to this incentive funding for the purposes of any continuation of award under grant.

So you apply for grant funds. You get awarded grant funds. Typically, we try to do those in a five-year increment. So in order to continue to receive funds every single year, we would have to really be looking at, what is the performance of that grantee, receiving those funds?

We, right now-- let me see if I can get back here. Let me see if I can pull it back up. Here we go. So right now, where we are in this process is, we are looking at this bill that has passed. It's been signed.

And while it's supposed to go into effect for September 1, it requires us to establish rules. Our rule process usually takes about nine months from start to finish. So I don't-- this is not something that's going to happen in this RFA period. This is something likely that will start with the next RFA period, beginning July 1 of 2024.

So it's really up to us to bring forward and interpret what this means and put this into action. So let me go back here, to my PowerPoint. uh-oh. Wrong one. This one.

So if y'all have questions, put them in there. Keep them coming. But really, just know that I am going to do everything that I can to not disrupt things. So we don't want to disrupt our funding at the local level. But we want to be responsive, obviously, to the bill. And we have to develop rules.

I'm saying all of this because as we are in the process of doing our rule development, you guys are going to get an opportunity to comment on those rules. And that's a good opportunity for y'all to go in there and say, hey, this is great or hey, we have some concerns, or whatever it may be.

Now the implementation, in terms of timeline for this, again, we have to develop rules. They'll go into chapter 800. And likely, that process will start in October, meaning public comment periods for the rules, I'm looking at probably late October, maybe early November.

We do plan to speak with the representatives' office, try to get a better sense of what is the intent here. And then we'll develop criteria and operational practices by PY '24-'25. So you'll see things in there, in terms of these performance-- what does that really look like? What does that criteria look like?

One thing I will say about the bill is it did not remove the Performance Based Funding criteria. So we'll continue to have this as a measure when we're talking about your incentive funds or your hold-back funds. So again, this coming year, this year, we're still going to have this Performance Based Incentive Funding that's going to include that criteria.

No changes there. And the bill did not remove that. So that will continue to be something that we will have to look at for incentive funding.

OK, the next bill I wanted to bring to your attention is Senate Bill 2032.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Mahalia?

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yes.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

We just got a question. Enrolled in a High School Equivalency program, does program mean class? In other words, this denominator for 70% doesn't include ESL population?

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Good question. So right now, the way that we are looking at this is we are looking at folks who are enrolled in considered a ninth grade equivalent. When this first came out, we were like, how do we do this?

So as a state, a little more than 50% of all the students in our state lack a high school diploma. And therefore, when we say they are enrolled in classes, we broadly say, well, then they're enrolled in a High School Equivalency course. Right? If you don't have one when you come here, you're enrolled in one.

It's not always apples to apples, though. You guys know this. We have folks that are ELLs that are just in the TABE. We're testing them with TABE but they're really high level and high-fluency ITPs. The data isn't always reflective, I guess is what I'm saying.

So when they're really talking about this 25%, what they're saying is that of all the money that we have in a certain area and all the services that are happening in that area, at least 25% of the students that they are working with have to be on a track to earn a High School Equivalency diploma-- or a post-secondary credential. So this would also be your IET students, would fall into that as well.

Now the Performance Incentive Funding is pretty specific. And it defines the post-secondary credential as basically an ATB, Ability To Benefit, specifically. We broadened that a little bit so we could be inclusive of our IT folks, and it not be necessarily a co-enrollment option. But it is leading to a credential of value. So we also include those folks.

That's where the 25% comes from. The 70% is the more difficult one. I don't think there's anyone-- I'd have to go back and look because we've been tracking it-- but I don't think there's any program that doesn't meet that 25% threshold. It's the 70% that makes it difficult. And you have to meet both.

The 70%, as you guys know, we have retention issues. We have students that come in. They leave. They come back. They come out. We have some students that are exiting and come back multiple times before they actually earn their credentials.

The 70% is a little more difficult because of the program year designation. So if a student were to exit, let's just say, last program year, any point in time, last program year, the expectation is that 70% of all of your exits from last program year, that fit this criteria, fit this 25% criteria, that they would earn their High School Equivalency credential.

So that makes it very difficult. You guys know-- I don't think I have to explain that. You guys know the reality there. But that's essentially what the Performance Incentive Funding is measuring.

What we have to do, with 1602, is look at that language and develop something that is comparable to that in terms of establishing criteria, just like any of your other contracted measures that you have. We are still in discussion, in terms of what is this going to look like, what's going to make the most sense, what's not going to be disruptive, but is still going to be responsive to the representative's request.

So there's a lot more that's going to be happening on this. I just want all of you to be aware that it's not going to affect this year because we have to develop the rules. And that just takes time. But you will have an opportunity to be responsive to the rules. And then I hope that you will

because it will give you some good insight, hopefully, to how this will look from an operational perspective. Other questions?

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Yes. So there's three more questions. First one is, "enrolled also includes a participant that has passed at least one GED/HiSET test?" Right?

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

That's correct because we are using the credential methodology, Mary Jo. So you're correct. If they take and pass at least one GED or the High School Equivalency test, then they would be considered in that denominator for that 25%. That's the way we're measuring the Performance Based Funding right now.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK. And to continue with Mary Jo-- and then I'll jump back up to Susan's-- so for the HP-1602 rule, the 25% participants include HSE and IET students? TPFA will only be for HSE?

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Right now, they both-- it'll be both, Mary Jo because that's how it's written. So if we stick with. And that's something we can consider when we're thinking about comparable because it doesn't say verbatim or it doesn't say exactly.

So we can be looking at, well, comparable, are we really going to solely focus on our HSE students? Or do we want to include our IET students into that as well? I think that we will have some flexibility to come up with something in terms of interpreting that language. Yeah.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

And then going back to Susan's, "do you think this will incent programs to screen out and not serve low-level students such as prereaders?" And then a follow up to that was, "or limit funding to organizations that serve very low level students."

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Right. My response would be, I hope not. And my goal-- my probably first goal in all of this is to make sure that we can stabilize funding to whatever extent possible at the local level. I have been doing this long enough to know-- and when your organizations-- and I think you would agree-- that if we start down a road where your organizations don't feel secure in the amount of funds they're going to be receiving every year, to where it's very drastic from year to year, that really destabilizes the funding.

It destabilizes programs at the local level. And I don't think that is the intent. And I don't think it's the intent to screen out or get in a situation where we're creaming these students that are just right there.

The bottom line is, well, you certainly probably could. We've got 3 million people in Texas that don't have a high school diploma. And we could certainly just say, well, we're going to serve the top 10% with our funds. But I don't think that is the intent, to screen out.

However, I do feel like having GED and High School Equivalency programs that can quickly fast track students, in terms of hybrids, blended learning, subject specific, leveled classes, are going to be a place that we're going to have to really think about and local programs are really going to have to think about.

Some of you already have this and are already doing this. I know that. I can see it in the data. And right now, we are currently working with our data folks to analyze our High School Equivalency programs across the state, just so we can see what's out there right now and what is the impact. And there's a lot of analysis that goes into something like this.

So Susan, I don't know if that answers your question. But my response is I hope that it doesn't. But I do think that we'll get to a place where programs at least have to consider, for the students that are of a higher-- and are closer and are ready, you've got to quickly get them in and quickly get them credentials so that you have enough students to maintain some of these performance numbers.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK, and this follows along. "Will this also discourage providers from serving ESL students?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Again, I hope not. I don't think that is the intent at all of the bill. I also don't think it's the intent of the bill to have less focus on our youth because they tend to be a little more-- a little bit more retention issues with our youth population.

I don't think that's the intent of the bill. I think the intent of the bill is really to make sure that when people come into our program, that they have a fast track to earning a credential that's going to get them on their pathway and get them on their way so we don't have students that are coming in that are ready, willing, and we are acting as a slowdown because maybe we don't have enough staff or we don't have-- we're only open and have classes--

[AUDIO OUT].

And maybe they need more. So it is going to be, I think, a little bit more. We need to be more responsive for students that are willing to come into the program and are looking to get their credential in a quick fashion.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK, another question not along those lines. "For the 70% exiters enrolled in post-secondary, what is the timeline for them to earn the credential? Before the program year or by the program of study?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Program year. That's the tough part because what if they exit in May or June for that matter? So that's part of the language, at least, in the Performance Incentive Funding right now. Again, we have no language in rule for this 1602.

So these are all really good questions. Keep them coming. They keep my brain working on how we can come up with something comparable but not crippling in that way. So Terry, you're correct. So the 70% is program year. They have to earn the credential before the end of the program year in which they exited. That is what the Performance Based Funding currently states.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK. Another question. "Are you analyzing at provider level or grant recipient level for the HSE data?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Right now, we're doing the grant recipient level. However, this was something that I think we brought up with the Analytics team maybe a couple of weeks ago. And I think we will get down to the provider-level data as well. And I actually have something. It's not quite ready. But I'm hoping it will be here, in the next couple of weeks, that we'll be able to share with you guys.

It's a new HSE report that we've been working with our I3 on developing. And it's meant to be a little bit of a predictive modeling. But it's also just meant to look at different types of High School Equivalency programming that we have. So again, you're going to hear me use this term, fast-track GED.

We'll hopefully be able to share that with you. We've been working on some cool tools and things like that. The provider level is a good one, Mary Jo. It's one of the things we brought up and said, well, we need to be able to split some things out. So that's going to make it probably a little time-- we'll need more time, basically, to develop that.

So it may be that we put this one out initially. And then we'll have to come back. And we can put out a more detailed provider one in the future.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Thanks. And one more question. "So if a person comes in quarter three, they have to credential by end of program year?" Quarter three.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

If they exit. Yeah, if they exit. Now if they don't exit and they're still participating with you-- this is also, guys, if you think about this in that terms, it only really impacts those that have exited the program. So this is not just about developing fast-track High School Equivalency programs, credential programs. It's also about retention.

So you have to look at your local management practices. If you have long gaps over the summer, where you're not engaging your students, and those students are falling into denominators just because of something that's happening locally, you might want to look at that because this really impacts your exiters. So if you're keeping them engaged and you're keeping them in the program, that's another strategy.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK. We've got more questions rolling in. "Could we consider some types of incentives offered for GED completions? Workforce Solutions uses this approach for milestones towards completions."

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yeah. I'll look into that. We had looked at-- so on the Title I side and the Board side of the house, they use something-- and for a Board folks that are out there, that are familiar, can put some information in chat.

But they call it non-monetary incentives. So in certain workforce programs, if persons achieve certain milestones in their educational journey, like they're enrolled in a health class and they get their CPE certification or something like that, they can set up to have these non-monetary incentive awards. What does that really look like? It can be cards, go to the movies, here's a gas card, something like that.

But yeah, I can look into that and see if there's an option. Obviously if there's something that is allowable, that we can do, that you guys feel like might help be a carrot instead of a stick, I am all for that approach. So I will look into that.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK. And one more question. And this is from Deb Hargrove. "So when TCALL hotline gets calls about starting a high school GED program, or if they want to start a charter school for adult ed, should we continue to send them to TWC, AEL, or somewhere else because it's charter?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

You can continue to send them to us. And that is actually-- I don't know if we have any other sections. But it's a good segue into the next Senate bill that I want to talk about. So yeah, Deb, you can continue to send them to us.

OK, so y'all keep thinking about 1602. And I'll keep you posted as we continue to work on how we're going to operationalize that and of course, keep you updated on any of the rule timelines for that. Right now I've just been swamped with some other stuff. But I'm going to have to very quickly turn the corner and start working on rule development.



OK, Senate Bill 2032. This is relating to adult high school charter school programs. And the nuts and bolts of this are that a couple of legislative sessions ago, you guys are probably familiar that the state implemented this Adult High School Charter Program.

They piloted it with Goodwill Excel Center, I think for the first year or the first session. They came back the next session, which was the 87th. And I believe they started to open it up to other types of entities that could apply for this and could apply to be an Adult High School Charter Program.

And then this legislative session, they really kicked the door open even further and opened it up to community colleges as well. So this would be something that you would, as a community college or other eligible entity, you would apply, through TEA, become an adult high school-- charter-- Adult High School Charter School.

I don't know why I can't say. That I just can't. And you would get foundational school funding for those adults that are coming through that program. And you would be able to essentially award them a recognized diploma from the state of Texas.

The reason why I feel like this is important for you guys, because well, we have a lot of community college folks in the room. And so it's important, I think, since you're already operating an adult program, it's not a stretch to say, hey, maybe you want to be a part of this. It's a great way to think about blending some funds and being able to really expand all of the programs that we've been doing in adult ed into a charter school opportunity. So I just wanted you guys to be aware.

The next one is similar. It's related to the establishment of the Opportunity High School Diploma program. This one is a little bit more specific to our community college system in that it provides authority to the Coordinating Board to essentially approve community colleges that want to apply for this-- to be an Opportunity High School Diploma program.

So a community college applies to the Coordinating Board. The Coordinating Board has to establish rules related to this. They have to establish criteria related to this. But essentially, community colleges could apply and say, hey, we want to do that. We want to be able to have this adult high school diploma program.

And through that process, the community college can develop competency-based exams, which get approved by the Coordinating Board in relation to and in partnership with TEA, but that the community colleges would be an entity that can actually award a high school diploma through this process.

So that's big. That's not happened here in Texas. Only TEA, specifically accredited, and in-statute programs, in the past, have been able to actually award a high school diploma. What

you'll notice, if you really go back the last couple of legislative sessions, is that Texas has been trying to create more opportunity for folks to earn diplomas because it's the foundation for everything else.

So they're coming at it at every single way that we possibly can. I go back to saying we have a lot of folks in Texas that don't have a high school diploma. The pandemic has exasperated that issue. So we're trying, I think.

The state is really trying to create as many opportunities as they can for people to come back and to earn that credential that puts them on a pathway for a true career pathway, where they can then go into post-secondary education, get a credential through that, and then move on. So they're really trying their best, I think, to create some options for adults, here in Texas.

I see Cindy had a question. "Senate Bill 2032 and Senate Bill 2139 be potentially combined and blended?" I don't know. It's a good question, Cindy. It would probably depend on how they're being funded.

I don't know if all of these are going to be coming through Foundation School funding. I'd have to go back and look at the appropriations, which I have not done, to see if this is GR, which is our state General Revenue funded, or if it's coming through a Foundation School funding thing, like the current adult charter high schools, are like the Goodwill Excel center. I don't know. It's a good question, Cindy. I will ask around and go back and look and see how things were appropriated.

The last one I wanted to bring-- and I think you guys are probably-- many of you are probably more of an expert on this, and hopefully have been involved in conversations related to House Bill 8-- this was-- I call them a dumpster bill. And that just means because there's just a lot of stuff in there.

So this is a very lengthy bill. It has a lot of additions and revisions to the education code in there. So if you haven't went through and actually read how House Bill 8, I really encourage you to do that. There's a lot of really good stuff in there. I've just listed out a couple of bullets here, that as I was reading through it, these are things that popped out to me.

The first one is the expansion of dual credit. There is a lot of language in there about expanding dual credit to not only folks who are meeting certain criteria at the secondary level, but any student that wants to participate in dual credit.

There is a provision in there about community colleges having to now provide a relative cost versus potential earnings, as students are enrolling in those colleges. So if you have a student that wants to come in and get a Liberal Arts degree, you have to sit down and say, it's going to cost you this much.

And here are the occupations that you could potentially get, related to this degree. And this is what they pay. So it's really providing upfront information to the students so it can better help them make decisions about degree plans and career pathways.

Another one was related to Performance Based Funding and outcomes for community college systems. So it's not all about enrollments. It's really focusing on are they earning those credentials, are they completing, and that there be some sort of Performance Based Funding almost related to that. So it's a good read.

The last one that I saw on there really focuses on skill attainment, so more options to earn certificates, credentials, and degrees from everyone. So the good thing-- here's the thing about us, folks, is that you guys, what, two years ago, when we sat down, we were highly focused on enrollments for a long time.

And a couple of years ago, I guess in 2020 when the pandemic hit and I became director, I was like, look, we can enroll a million people. But if only 10% of them are earning anything of value, that's going to help them with upward economic mobility, that's going to help them get on the career pathway, then we're just not doing what we need to be doing.

And I think the college model is also really looking at well, but what is happening with the people that are getting enrolled? Are they getting credentials? Are they better off than they were when they came here? Or are they leaving with a ton of student debt and no credential, and now they're worse off? And it's a good question we should be asking ourselves. So I'm really happy to see some of the revisions and language in House Bill 8. I hope you guys are too.

OK, I want to spend the last time that we have today talking about a couple of new things. Some of these I'll go through pretty quickly because I don't know a whole lot yet. And then some others, we can spend some time on. The first one is new NRS test. Well, they're coming.

So this came out in the Federal Register maybe a couple of weeks ago. We have some new tests that have been approved for seven years. So this is you either have a seven-year approval process, through the NRS and through OCTAE or a three-year.

So there are four tests that are approved for the next seven years. You have your CASAS math goals. And that's going to be good for ABE all levels. We have BEST Plus 3.0. We have for-- and not just us. I say "we," I mean the state of Texas.

You guys in particular, other states, other programs, have been talking to BEST Plus and CAL for a while, just about, hey, these students are topping out. Then we've got to TABE them, even though they're not really here for a High School Equivalency class. There's this disconnect. I'm hoping some of this gets resolved with the BEST Plus 3.0. We shall see.

So that's going to be good for ESL at all levels. And then we have the CASAS listening steps, again, ESL all levels, and then the CASAS reading steps, ESL, all levels. So those have been approved for seven years. I think they actually are officially approved to start in March.

Because we already have our testing guide submitted to OCTAE, our plan for all of these is to do a short period of time where you get to kick the tires, meaning I'm trying to get it all set up in TEAMS as soon as it becomes available from the publishers, and get it set up in TEAMS so we can just, like I said, we can test it.

You guys can get familiar with it. We can work out any bugs and kinks. The official testing guide probably won't have these tests available until July 1 of 2024. So just know that if you don't plan on applying for the grant, you don't have to worry about it. But if you do, then these will be some of the changes that will be forthcoming.

And then we also have the addition of two new tests. Now I heard that is used to be part of the NRS way back in 2008. They were removed. And now they're back. I wasn't here during that time. So I can't really speak to that. But we do have two new options. One is the ACT WorkKeys applied math. And the other is the ACT WorkKeys workplace documents.

Now the applied math is good for ABE at all levels. However, the workplace documents is very specific to ABE levels two through six only. So I'm trying to wrap my head around well, what does that mean for us and how do we do that.

So we're working with TCALL folks. We're going to be getting some information between now and when these tests actually can be used and go live. And we'll be having many more meetings and probably some work groups related to this.

Now the current tests that we have are good. And they're good through the end of this program year. So there's no reason to have to change it. Like I said, we do plan on making the other ones available as soon as we can, so that you guys can start to utilize them if you choose to.

If you want to purchase them, you can put them in the system. You can start to roughly roll it out. So it's not just something that abruptly starts July 1. But the current tests that you have are good through the end of this program year. So don't fret.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

OK, so there's a couple of questions. Tracy says that, "also, BEST Literacy 2.0 will be coming out."

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Oh, awesome. I must have missed it on my list.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Well, I can't imagine why there's. There's just a couple of changes there. Another question, "will the BEST Plus 3.0 be online and keep a cumulative database of scores, similar to TABE? Or will the scores still reside in individual testers' computers?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Oh, good question, Abel. I don't to the extent it'll be exactly the way that TABE is set up. But yes, one of the goals of BEST Plus 3.0 is to not have-- it's going to be a web-based system, is my understanding. Tracy, if you want to jump in there and say anything about that but--

>> TRACY:

No. Right. Mahalia, you're right. It will be web based. There'll be a new platform. So the computer can be-- testing can be done offline or online. But when, say, tests have been done offline and someone goes into the office, plugs into the web, then all the scores will upload into the system, of the tests that were given while the computer was offline.

So it will be a new system. It sounds like it might be similar to TABE. But it will be a new system, a new platform. That's about all I can think.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yeah, that's all we know right now. So there's going to be a lot of improvements, just in terms of the functionality of how you can store and how you're going to be able to interact with the test and things like that. So all good things. Abel, I think y'all are going to enjoy the new features that are going to be offered.

But we'll have more information on this. I'm going to be working with TCALL. Hey, TCALL, here's your notice. I'll be working with TCALL to try to get a work group together so that we can continue-- once we get to a point where we're feeling a little more comfortable with just the way this is going to look, the features that are going to be added, we'll have a work group that we can include some stuff from the field, once it becomes available to us, that maybe we can test this.

I know there was a question out there about the WorkKeys test scores could become an MSG. Yes, that's my understanding, is that if it's approved, that you should be able-- one of the key components is that you have to be able to pre- and post-test students. So it would be part of that. They would provide us with cut scores just like they do with everything else. We would put that information into TEAMS. And then that's how it would determine whether or not a student has made an advancement.

TABE is still going to be an option, yes. And I'll go back and look. I can't remember. The current TABE I think is approved through-- ooh, 2025, '06? But actually yes, TABE will still be an option.

Will we be able to use BEST Plus 3.0 before 2.0 expires in June, for a transitions period? Yes. Again, our goal is to have the 3.0 available to you in March or April so that you guys can go in and play around with it. You can work with it.

And then officially in the testing guide, it will become eligible for-- in the guide, actually, for July 1. So you'll get an opportunity to be able to work with the product and see how it works before you go out and buy a bunch of stuff and want to transition everyone. We'd like to give you that transition period. Obviously a lot of staff training involved and everything like that as well.

OK, I want to talk a little bit about the performance for this year. Enrollment target negotiations-- where are we? Well, here's where we are. We received all the responses. We're currently reviewing them. We will contact you if any further discussion is needed. So if you haven't heard from us by now, it probably means that we're accepting your targets.

We had a couple of folks we had to go back and connect with. But if you haven't heard from us by now, it means that we're probably going to accept your targets and just move forward.

Carry-forward targets, however are still in the process and still being worked. We had to wait for the final financials to come in so that we could really work on this carry-forward target number. We now have that. So I3 is working on that. Once we get those numbers, I will share them with you.

So the goal is to take everything to the Commission at one time so that when I take this forward to the Commission, it's all going to be approved. And we will have final targets said and done hopefully by the end of August or the beginning of September. So instead of staggering it out like we have in the past, I'm hoping just to get it all done.

So what does that mean for you right now? It means that whatever you send in to us, you can guarantee that, at a minimum, will be a target for this year. We need to add the carry forward on top of that.

Those of you who know what your carry-forward balances are can probably estimate, pretty much, what any carry forward and how that's going to land. But everything will be said and done. And we'll be sharing that, hopefully, with you soon. I'm hoping next week.

I'm going to be out next week. I know many of you will be too because you'll be at Literacy Texas. But I'm hoping we'll have some final carry-forward numbers by next week. And that way we can share with you the final numbers that we'll be taking to the Commission for approval.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

And there was another question in here. "Are you aware of dual credit with adult high school?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

I'm not. I see that question from Kathy. Now I know that some of our programs and some of our providers are utilizing their CTE at their high school. I believe Socorro is one of them. There may be some others out there that are currently utilizing, I believe, their CTE instructors, who are doing dual credit for the secondary-- K through 12 kids. And they're hiring them to also do the EITs for adult ed.

Now in conversations that we've had with the Coordinating Board, this setup of this dual credit-- it's not the way you're thinking, Kathy, probably. I don't want to call it dual credit. But it should be-- and those colleges should be accepting-- if you were to do a CTE with your CTE instructors, for an IET, the college should be accepting those credits as transferable credits.

But I'm not aware of any specific things in legislature, , happening that's dual credit related for specifically for adults. So let me know. OK. I see your thumb's up.

But the CTE programs that some of our ISDs are doing are super cool. And I encourage you to reach out. There's always an opportunity to expand, especially in rural programs that may have CTE programs. CTE is making a comeback. It's another thing you probably saw this legislative session, is just we've got to bring back some trades and some stuff that's happening in our K through 12 system. So we may see a big expansion with CTE in the K through 12 area.

OK, let's talk about TEAMS codes. And I know I'm going to get some questions on here. So let's talk about TEAMS codes. So there were a couple of updates to the performance guide-- not very many. Really, it was this table and maybe some other tables related to updates of performance targets.

But this table, that was updated-- and I believe it's, again, on page 16-- this is what aligns to your enrollment targets. So we get a lot of questions every year about well, this fund code is available. And somebody used it. And how does that roll up into a performance target?

We have to set these up very specifically, every single year. And it is unfortunate that in TEAMS-- and we are working on this-- that if I go into TEAMS and I put an end on a fund code, and I say, no one can use this fund code after this date, TEAMS still allows it. And it's something weird in the coding that has to do with a period of participation for a student.

So even though I may go in and say you can't attach any new students to a fund code, and TEAMS was like, OK, no problem, there is something in there that is allowing students to have an open period of participation or were prior attached to a certain fund code, to be able to utilize that fund code moving forward. I'm working on figuring out what it is. I just don't know what it is. But we're doing some analysis.

But the important thing for you to understand is that only these codes are going to count towards a target. So you can enter whatever codes you want for your students. But this is me telling you guys, these are the ones that are going to count.

So when the MPR comes out, and those are-- the MPR is what we use to determine CAPS, TAPS, all of our incentive funds, those are the numbers that we are going to be using. These are the codes that we are going to be using for all of that.

So what I'm telling you is don't use other codes. Just don't-- because you're not going to get credit. And I want all of you to get credit.

So one of the big questions that we've been getting since the year opened and I guess since the guide came out-- so I wanted to take some time to address it-- is why does the ESL Professional Civics not count towards intensive now? So I'm going to do my best to explain this. So let me actually see. Did I put any other things in here? Yes, I did. OK.

So I'm going to try my best to explain this. So prior to us doing combined funding, prior to us combining all the funds together, we never counted ESL for professionals that was being funded with EL Civics funding towards the intensive target. The reason for that is because your EL Civics money is meant to support internationally trained professionals anyway and specifically.

That funding is in statute, in regs, and our state guidance, specifically designed already to support that population. So prior to us combining the funds, we never counted any of your EL Civics funding that was happening to support ITP professionals towards an intensive target.

So when you look at this in PY 2021, you'll notice that under the intensive target, when we're talking about ESL for professionals, there's no EL Civics in there. And that's because we never counted it.



What happened was when we started combining the funds, then there's no way to split the baby anymore. There's no way to say that you're spending that funding or that your funding is EL Civics funding specifically because we just combined it all.

So when we did that, we had to essentially allow for the option that you could utilize some portion of your EL Civics funds, which are in this giant pot of money, to count towards that intensive and serving those ITPs.

And because EL Civics is really designed for that purpose and to specifically outreach that population, we had to make sure there was a fund code and there was a way for us to say yeah, we're still doing the work. We're still working with this population with those funds. So that's where that fund code came from.

Flash forward to this year. Now we've separated everything back out. And now we know that anything that you're reporting under your EL Civics and your other funding, now we can separate it back out and we can see it again. So that's the reason behind it. I know it probably doesn't make sense to a lot of folks. And I'm just going to say this. It doesn't have to.

Just know that when we designed the EL Civics or the intensive services way back when, that was to support continuity for that program service and type across funding streams. Your EL Civics was always meant to support ITPs and career pathways back to employment, back to credentials. It was always meant for that.

We created this intensive service with your AEFLA funds to mimic that and so we would have continuity of those services funding streams. So just know that there's method behind the madness. But what I want to be very clear with you guys on is that these are the codes that are going to count.

So don't stray from them or if you do, this is probably the first step where we're going to come back and say, well, you're using a code that isn't really rolling up into the total.

So I'm going to stop. I see that Todd, I think, had a question. Let me see if I can get over to it.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Yeah, you want me to read it to you or--

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

I can read it. Thank you. OK, it says-- no problem. So Todd says, "Would you code someone more than one code? For example, if we get someone that enrolls and is a re-entry corrections

because they are on parole, would you ever code them as basic AEL AEFLA? Or would they always be coded as re-entry corrections? Is the MACC a new code?"

MACC is not a new code. We've had that one in there-- maybe since 2020. I can't remember why I can't remember right off the top my head. But it's not new. And we wanted it to count as direct hours to this grant if you were utilizing that State Leadership Project. But that's not new.

The other part of your question, Todd, about-- for example, if we get someone that enrolls in a reentry corrections because they are on parole, would you ever code them as basic AEL AEFLA or would they always be coded as reentry corrections? The example I like to use for this, I think, is more so related to our ITP population.

It could very well be that a person comes in, an internationally-trained, professional person comes in, and they are receiving ESL services. And they are receiving services meant to really work with an internationally-trained professional. We're hooking them up with labor market information. We're helping them navigate all the jobs. We're doing civics. We're doing all those things. At some point, they may transition. And it may be necessary for them to transition into an IET.

So they may start out as EL Civics, EL Civics and then transition into an IET. And that's totally allowable. The activity codes in TEAMS are meant to tell the story of the student and what activities they're participating in. So you will have instances where students can start one place and then as they just naturally transition into other services, you would start using a different activity code to identify that. So yes, that happens.

So is there no regular ESL fund code option? Oscar, do you want to-- oh, wait, there's one for Mary Jo too. Sorry. "Does this mean that EL Civics EL Civics code is only for ESL classes that are paid with 243 funds?" Yes. Good question, Mary Jo.

So now that we have re-separated the funding, guys, you have to really separate it in your minds because you should only be coding students EL Civics EL Civics if you're paying for that class with your EL Civics 243 [AUDIO OUT]

So right now, you should be looking at what is your budget for 243. And you should be deciding-- which is why we go through this hurdle-- and deciding how many students you can enroll in the year for that specific funds. And you've got to start separating those out in your minds.

Now some of you will have blended classes. And you'll have to go back to cost allocating. You can also do that. Or you can keep them totally separate. That is a local decision. But you do have to understand how you're utilizing those 243 funds when it comes to your expenditures, whether that's staffing, whatever it may be, you've got to start separating it back out.

So there is no regular ESL fund code option. So regular ESL is just a basic. So if you are paying for a class and you're setting things up and you're paying that instructor with 231 money in your combined federal TANF State GR and that's how you're funding that person, then it's just regular services, basic AEFLA.

If you are establishing an ESL class and you are funding that class with your 243 funds, it would be EL Civics, EL Civics. If you're splitting them and some of the students are going to be funded out of your 243 and some of your students are going to be funded out of 231, you could potentially have a class that looks just like that in TEAMS. 50% of this staff salary is going to be funded for 231.

50% is going to be funded with 243. You guys have to develop a cost allocation plan for how you're going to split that out. But you could do that through utilization of the activity codes in TEAMS.

I know. This is so complicated. I hate it, guys. I hate it as much as y'all hate it. Let's see. "Why does one message say ESL professional is not an intensive, but it's listed as an intensive on the chart? I am so confused."

Larissa, I feel you. It's confusing for us too. You ought to hear the conversations that we have at the state level. It's just like this. So I'm going to say to all of you right now. Don't feel like I'm not getting this. It is complicated. And we over complicated it because we tried to combine the funding. And then we were told we couldn't do it. So now we have to revert back to something else because if we get audited, we'll be in trouble.

So Larissa, what I will tell you-- again, I'm going to go back. And I would encourage all of you to the source, which is the statute. Your English Literacy and Civics funds are meant to support English language learners, specifically your internationally-trained professionals, in delivering services-- English language acquisition services, which is going to be reading, writing, math, and language support -- that lead to career pathways and work.

That's what the 243 funds have always been designed to do. Specifically, it is for English language learners. You can't spend those funds on someone who's not an English language learner. It's not what it's meant to or designed to do.

So the reason why, when you're looking at this chart and it says ESL for Professionals under Intensive, but we're only saying you're a AEFLA funds or local funds can count for that is because your 243 funds are already meant to meet that purpose.

So it's not like it's above and beyond the cost per, like we're saying probably with your AEFLA funds, might have to do some additional work there, because the 243 funds are specifically to

serve English language learners. You know and I know that your English language learners are the cheapest service you can offer, just historically.

The cost per to do an ESL class is the least expensive, across the board, that we have. So you're still getting a cost per to include the services for that 243 under your 243 funds. It's just not going to be an intensive service because with your AEFLA funds, you've got to do a little bit more work to beef up those classes and include the services needed to even call it an intensive service. It can't just be an ESL class.

I know there's going to be 1,000 questions about this. Elena and I were talking about this. And oh, my gosh. Even my own staff are like, oh, this is going to be awful. And we know it. And we knew it was going to be awful.

So I'm going to go back. And I'm going to say this. And I'll briefly read through some of the questions. And we'll definitely take them back. If we have to release some guidance, we will.

So Octaviano says, "So will we be getting two IET targets, one for AEFLA and one for EL Civics?" Yes, that's what was on the target tool. You will have two targets, one specifically for your AEFLA funds one for your EL Civics dollars.

Ashley says, "Just to be clear, we'll code our ITP classes for ESL professionals AEFLA." If you're utilizing your 231s for that class, absolutely, Ashley. That's what you would want to do.

Kathy says, "So now, they aren't activity codes but funding." Sort of, Kathy, yeah, much to my disapproval. But it's just hard to split the baby when the funds are like they are. So you can think of it as you need to be very cognizant when you are entering activity codes and fund codes for your students.

What we've seen in the past-- let me give you guys an example. This is what we don't want. And this is why you have to be more thoughtful on how you're setting up this stuff. This is what we don't want. I, as a state director, am trying to work with I3 on making sense of what activities we're doing, what does that look like, what kind of services are our students getting, all of this. We do this all the time.

We go back historically. And even though I know-- and Kathy, I'm just using you guys as an example-- even though I know that ACC only got, let's just say, \$100,000 in EL Civics money, when I go and I look in TEAMS, oh, they served 50,000 people with that small amount of money. It's this astronomical number, which doesn't make any sense.

And we have to report this. We have to report certain things. And it's just because a basic ESL class being funded with your 231 is probably going to look very similar to your ESL class that's being funded with 243, especially the fact that are continuous across fundings. Our content standards don't care about funds. It's all about instruction and service.

The problem is that when we look at it, we can't make heads or tails. Oh, OK, we have literally \$8 million, statewide, of EL Civics money. But we are serving this super-high percentage, just by looking at these codes in TEAMS, of the state with these EL Civics funding.

So it makes the cost per for those look minuscule, minuscule. And I know that's not the truth. It's just a coding issue. It's just a TEAMS thing. So I'm constantly having to say, yeah, but that's not reality, yeah, but that's not reality.

So what would make things, I think, a lot better for us and for you guys, so that we could properly analyze everything, is really think about what your 243 budget is. Think about how many classes, instructors, cost associated with serving x number of people, however many you feel like that is, with those specific funds. And code them accordingly.

Separate them out in your minds because your finance folks will thank you because you are going to have to have a cost allocation plan that makes sense. And it doesn't make sense if you have 10% of your budget going towards 40% of your total students. It just doesn't add up.

I know it's confusing, guys. It's awful. And I'm trying to figure out the best way to just keep it straight for you, to make your jobs easier and make sense because I know it's not easy. It will probably be easier in the future because I can say it now. The RFA is out. Because you're going to have to apply for these funds separately.

And these are going to be separate grants in the future if you want them. So it'll solve or resolve, hopefully, some of this. But you really have to start thinking about these different pots of money as separate programs because that's how they were always intended to be. We combined them because we want the financial piece to be better.

And we wanted to make the services have some continuity across. So if you have an ELL that's getting funded from 231 and an ELL that's getting funded out of your 243, well, there should be some comparable services happening for that population because it's still the population. And they still have needs.

What we didn't want is to have these vastly different services happening just because the funding was different and things like that. But in the future, hopefully some of this at least will get resolved. But for this year, I want to make sure that you guys are comfortable with what's happening, comfortable with how you're going to be reporting. So we'll come back to this. And we'll do a little bit more discussion on it and let you guys speak freely-- you know what I mean-- about it.

So think about what we've said today. Take a look at some stuff. Think about what we've talked about today. And then prepare for the next biweekly call. If you want to send me your questions in advance, that would be helpful as well. You can go ahead and send them to me.

Just email them to me. And then that way we'll be prepared for the next call, to dive into this a little bit more.

OK. I'm going to move on. Hopefully you guys will stay with me. Stay with me. Let that one go. We've got more stuff coming. Let that one go for now.

OK, let's talk about our other targets. These are subject to change. I just say that because I do have to take all this to the commission. And I don't anticipate any changes. But that's just a disclaimer.

So you're employed-enrolled quarter two is 56% for this year. Your employed-enrolled quarters two through four is 83%. If you're new to this game and you're trying to figure out what does all that mean, go to your performance guide. It is all in there in terms of numerator and denominator, who counts, who doesn't. It's all in there.

The credential rate is 44%. We've been inching this up over the past probably five years, inching it up and inching it up. And the reason for that is because we need to be focused on getting students' outcomes. If we're putting people in IETs, we're paying for training, we have got to be focused on them earning those credentials, certificates, licensing within a year of exit. So 44% for this year.

The post-test rate is going to remain 65%. And again, all of this is defined in the performance guide. So I just wanted to give you some of those numbers since they're hot off the presses.

Your other targets related to your measurable skills gain-- so our overall state target-- that means the target that we have with the federal government-- is 45%. Your contracted targets-- we've always taken that overall state target, and we break it down into your contracted targets, and try to make it a little bit easier to digest in some ways. So your contracted targets are dependent on your student population and how students fall into each educational functioning level. We call this the blended average.

So your target actually changes over the course of the year. Or it can. So as you have more students moving into each of these levels, and knowing that each of these levels have a different target assigned to them, it can affect your overall target, which is why none of you have the same target. It's not a blanket target. It's really dependent on the population that you're serving.

So again, if you largely serve ESL, you're going to have a much higher measurable-skills gain target than someone that largely serves ABE. And the reason for that is on your screen. It's because the individual level targets are different across those two programs.

I'm going to stop there. Any questions on performance? I see there's still some in there on the EL Civics. Was there anything on the other targets?

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Yes, there was one. "If they receive a credential but haven't exited, does it count?"

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

Yes. So when we're looking at the credential, get it in TEAMS, folks. Get it in TEAMS. But when we're looking at the credential rate, they can earn it while they're with us or within a year of exit. So that's how much time you have for that one.

OK, moving on to TEAMS updates. I've got some good news. We received our appropriation request to enhance our systems. So through this last legislative session, I worked with my staff and my team here. We did a Legislative Appropriation Request.

Our system is still a web-based system. But as you guys know, it's aging. There's a lot of things in there. It just doesn't have all the bells and whistles that a lot of the current platforms have. And I think you guys deserve that. And I think the state deserves that so we can better showcase all the work that's happening in various ways and not just these federal ways, federal targets. But there's a lot of things that happen. And it's just been very difficult to capture in our current system.

So the good news is that we got the appropriation that we asked for. This is actually something that doesn't happen very often, so I wasn't even really prepared for. It's one of those things like, we asked for it. I didn't think we were going to get it. We got it. And so now it's a whole new workload.

So the good news is that we did get this. And that means that TEAMS is going to, over the next two years, we'll be working simultaneously on a project to upgrade TEAMS. What does this really mean in terms of what those upgrades are going to look like?

It'll be moving to a new platform. And we're going to try to maintain as much of the current functionality as we can. So hopefully we're not losing anything. But what we'll be able to gain is modernizing the security features that we have. We'll be able to upgrade the report and tool capabilities, so maybe do more query-based reports for you guys.

One of the big ones is connectivity and interfacing. We want our system to more easily be able to more easily connect with other systems so that we can get better interfacing with other systems, both internal and external.

User access controls may be something that now that we have this appropriation, it may not make sense for us to do all of this work on our new system, knowing it's going to be going

away. We're going to be getting something else. So we may move that project into this new TEAMS upgrade. We're still talking about that.

One of the big asks that I put in there-- I don't know if we'll get it-- is a student sign on. This will allow the student access to their own records. It would allow them to go in there, potentially upload information, upload certificates, upload things to help improve our enrollment processes and our follow-up processes, chat features, things like that.

So I think all of that is pretty exciting and incredibly exhausting. So we'll see. We'll see how this goes. But I'm excited about getting a new TEAMS and getting this system upgraded. And I hope you guys are too because you'll be part of piloting some of this. And definitely we'll have some workgroups along the way. So I hope you'll participate.

OK, so that's some good news. Now let's talk about what's the more immediate things that are coming out. So I think with the next release, we're going to keep pushing to get the security protocols updated in TEAMS. This is something we've been working on for what feels like a million years.

But what this essentially does is it allows us to put your P-41s, your FERPA, and your cybersecurity tracking in the system so that if you sign your P-41 on September 1 of 2023, the system is going to keep track of it.

And the system is going to send out emails as we get closer to September 1 of 2024, when that could potentially expire. And the system is going to automatically do some of this for us. Right now, It's poor little Blanca, one-man show over there, and trying to track-- I don't know how many TEAMS users we have right now, Blanca. 3,800? It's insane.

So we're really trying to go ahead and push that feature out so that it is in there because that poor little Blanca, every time I go through and I talk about this, I picture the guy with the stapler in the dungeon, just working on his stuff.

And I promise you Blanca's working conditions are much better than that. But she does have to really keep a very tight process on this right now so that we can pass all of our audits and stuff. So we all love Blanca. And we appreciate her. But let's make it easier on all of us.

The other thing that we're working on is our GED match process. I'm not going to go into specifics. But I actually think this is something that in the future, I may go into more detail with you guys on a bi-weekly call. Our GED match process is very detailed. And what we have learned is that it will never be perfect. It just will never be perfect. The reason for that is because we're dealing with humans. And humans are not perfect.



So we are currently in the process to try to make it as good as we can make it through an automated process, and then potentially allow some features in there that put you guys and give you guys more manual control of some things.

Right now, our system is set up to where if the GED system and TEAMS talk to each other and there is a match on a Social Security number across systems, it will lay down a certificate. Doesn't matter if anything else matches.

Now some of you may think that that's strange, that Jane Doe, with the same Social Security number as Juan Carlos, would match up and TEAMS would lay the record down. But it's actually very common in data systems. If you have a unique identifier that matches, it's very common. That's just a common practice.

What we know is that sometimes numbers get transposed. Things happen. And those Social Security numbers, even though they match against systems, isn't always the same person. And we need the ability for you guys, who are working closely with the students, to tell us, hey, this isn't the right person.

We also need to make sure that our system is not inaccurately laying down Social Security numbers on students that it doesn't apply to. So there's lots of things going on there. We're having some good discussions. I feel like we're getting to a place where we can put in some safety protocols.

But again, guys, it's never going to be perfect. It will never, ever be perfect. We are also working with GED. They have a duplication process on their end that they're dealing with as well. And so this is a cross-- just know that this is a cross-internal-external thing that we're working on. And hopefully we'll have some good news for you soon.

OK, so from Tara, "what is the deadline to submit the required annual TEAMS documents on the state level? Did I hear September?"

KARA MCVEY:

---

I think you just-- I think what you did was just give an example earlier, that if your P-41 was submitted back in September 2022, it will be due on September 2023. So it just depends on the way it falls on annual. It'll be the submission of your P-41-C, which is on the tracker. I hope that answers your question.

## MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

So Tara, the short version is it depends on what the date is for your P-41. We've been tracking these on an annual participant-level basis, which is why Blanca's head is always ready to explode.

But what we want to do is move this functionality to TEAMS so that you can go in there and say, I submitted my P-41 on this date. And then TEAMS will keep track of it and let you know hey, this is coming up. You need to resubmit this. And then if you guys don't, it's going to lock you out of the system until you submit them.

So Tara, hopefully that answers your question. It's not some blanket date. It's just based off of when it was submitted. So if you have folks that you're curious about, you can reach out to TEAMS Technical Assistance. And I Blanca can tell you that information.

Let's see. "Do you have the release date for the next TEAMS update?" Blanca, I don't think we have a solid release date yet. We were looking at doing one at the end of August. But we've been having a lot of back and forth. And I think we wanted to tweak a couple of things. So it may actually get extended into September.

So the details for our High School Equivalency Voucher program, I've been keeping you guys updated in terms of the legislative process for this. And I think we're going to be good. So we're currently working on our Interagency Contract with TEA. \$750,000 will be available for this year.

We're going to distribute that money based on usage. So we're going to be looking at who used vouchers last year. And we will proportionately distribute that \$750,000 based off of usage.

So once the committee approves the methodology and approves this approach, we will send out a tool, just like we have in the years past, that will give you the amount you have to use towards your vouchers. And then you will be able to tell us what voucher types you want. So the process is going to be exactly the same. We're not changing anything.

Then once we receive your tool back, we're going to build the tracker. And we will send them to you. And that will have all of your codes, essentially. Now the vouchers, again, barring any catastrophe-- man, we should knock on some wood-- they will end June 30. And the reason for that is because we will have new grants that start July 1.

Remember that's what it was supposed to be this year. Then we ended up having to extend the grants for a year. So we extended the vouchers to August. But this year they should end June 30 because we will have new grants July 1. So we'll be getting brand new stuff starting July 1 of 2024.

OK, so keep tracking and stay diligent. Kara mentioned, at the beginning of today's meeting, about having your standard operating procedure for how you're utilizing your vouchers tracking your vouchers. So make sure you review and understand everything that's in AEL Letter 03-22 in regards to this.

So we will still have a process, moving forward, that if you need to request more vouchers, you'll be able to do so. If you run out-- and it'll be the same process that it is now. You have to prove to us, with your tracker-- which is why it's important that you have an SOP and that you continue to track your usage on your tracker because if you want additional vouchers, you have to submit that to us and prove that you have utilized at least 70% of your current stock in any one type.

So that's not overall, but in that one type. So let's say you've used 70% of your computer-based vouchers and you want to request some more. Then you would have to show us the evidence that shows that you need more in that particular type.

So that is how that's going to work. Pretty straightforward. I am hoping that there is no delay between the end of July and September 1. We're going to be working very hard to get everything to the commission, get everything approved, get everything into the vouchers, the trackers, and get this done.

But there are a lot of steps between where we are right now and getting those actual voucher numbers in your hand. So if there is a delay, it won't be very long of a delay. But there may be a couple of weeks, just depending on when I can get this to the commission and get everything approved. But I'll keep you guys posted. But I'm really shooting for that September 1 date so we have no delay in the availability of the vouchers.

We will take any unanswered questions from today's meeting. And we'll try to frame them up. We obviously need to come back and talk about the EL Civics funding a little bit more. I will just express to you guys that the table in the performance guide is what we're using to determine targets. So keep that in mind.

But I do think that now is a good time for us to really start talking about the utilization of 243 and the implementation of an IELCE program because the future, as you know, will be much different. And go ahead and talk about that now. All right, any final questions before we sign off here? Look, nine minutes early.

## KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

Yes, so still no change in the age requirements for vouchers?

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

No change. Nothing came through this legislative session for that. So it's still only 21 and up.

KRYSTAL MOSHER:

---

"And then testing must occur before or by June 30 2024?"

MAHALIA BALDINI:

---

For the vouchers that you will get in September. The current vouchers that you have now essentially die August 31 of '23. So they essentially die at the end of next month. So they will no longer be useful. They will no longer be useful.

You will get new vouchers, new voucher codes, in September. And those vouchers will have a new end date of June 30, 2024. Good question. And we'll have some further discussions on the whole EL Civics thing.

Now is the time to start really, I think, framing some of this up and making sure that we're all on the same page with that. We've got a lot of new directors that came in even during the pandemic or after. And so for those of you out there that your head is spinning, it's OK. Totally fine. There's been a lot going on, been a lot of changes in five years. So thank you guys so much for sticking with us. Thank you so much for joining us today.