

**Second Meeting**  
**Region IV Regional Professional Development Advisory Council ( RPDAC)**  
**Manatee Community College**  
**Bradenton, Florida**  
**Friday, February 12, 1999**

**MINUTES**

**1. Welcome**

Dr. Peter Easton, Florida State University, called the meeting to order at 10:40 a.m. He thanked everybody for attending the second meeting and noted that the first meeting was successful. He introduced Dwight Hyle, DOE Region 4 team, who was attending on behalf of Ted Bruce.

Philip McClung took the opportunity to welcome everybody in UCC and announced the availability of coffee, drinks and a telephone in his office.

Renew Introduction:

Dr. Easton introduced himself and asked the others to introduce themselves since there were new participants at the meeting. Those in attendance included:

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kathy Browers, *Pinellas County Schools*  
Elizabeth W. Chaney, *Dunbar Community School*  
Patrick Lucey, *Glades Correctional Institute*  
Philip L. McClung, *Manatee Community College*  
Michael McLeod, *South Florida Community College*  
Dr. Leo Mediavilla, *Collier County Public Schools Adult & Community Education*  
Mavis Pacetti, *Lee County Adult Education*  
Joe Perez, *Hillsborough County Schools Department of Adult & Community Education*

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANTS PRESENT:**

Lair Decker, *Hillsborough County Schools Department of Adult & Community Education*  
Dr. Marilyn Gillespie Martinez, *Adult Literacy/Workplace Education/ESOL Consultant*

**FSU TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Eqbal Darandari, Research Assistant  
Dr. Peter Easton, Principle Investigator  
Cynthia L. Godbey, Project Director

**DOE TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dwight Hyle, Regional Consultant – Region 4

**COUNCIL MEMBER5 ABSENT:**

Gayle Brooks, *Pasco-Hernando Community College*

Mary Cantrell, *Manatee District Schools*  
Dr. Sylvia M. Carley, *Hillsborough Community College*  
Diane Davis, *Hardee Correctional Institution*  
Steve Hull, *Polk Community College*  
Dr. Michael McCoy, *Hardee A.R.C.*  
Connie Mundzak, *Hillsborough County Employment & Training Division*

Disseminate Updated Council directory:

Ms. Godbey distributed the *Updated Council Directory* and asked everybody to note any corrections. Dr. Easton wrote those corrections on the board including his telephone number:

- Dr. Easton: Tel. Number (644-8165)
- Ms. Elizabeth Chaney: Address: "1857 High Street"
- Mr. Patrick Lucey: "institution" and "Sun Com" added to Tel. Number
- Dr. Leo Mediavilla: Title "Administrator"
- Mr. Michael McLeod: Tel. Number (452-6042)

Mr. Perez made a point of clarifying that Ms. Martinez has been actively involved in other related activities in Florida, including those covered by ACE of Florida. Ms. Godbey commented that she invited Valerie Boyd, from the Tallahassee ACE of Florida office, to attend that meeting.

Objectives for Meeting:

Dr. Easton reviewed the objectives for the meeting reminding the members that there were still some issues from the first meeting, such as the selection of the chairperson and adoption of by-laws. Other items on the agenda include a review of old business including the Needs Assessment process, selecting a regional lead institution to provide support for the Council and regional training initiatives, and evaluating the process to date. He asked for feedback on the agenda and there was none.

Housekeeping Issues/ Announcements:

Mr. Hyle announced that his office has some money available, so if funds are needed for a small project they may be able to fund it (approximately \$25,000).

Ms. Godbey announced that she had corrected travel reimbursement forms to be signed by some of the Council members who had attended the first meeting and that lunch will be handled the same as the first meeting.

Dr. Easton announced that the next region to start a regional council will be Region II and its first meeting will be on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March. They will be proceeding similarly, however their council has been limited to 10 members. He also mentioned that this project would be presented at *the 1999 Florida Literacy Conference* in May.

## **2. Council Organization**

### Discuss, Debate and Adopt Governance Structure/ Bylaws

Ms. Godbey disseminated copies of the draft by-laws pointing out that they were primarily derived from the project proposal, but open to any changes that the Council members desire. She went over the main issues which they needed to decide on: governance structure (Executive Committee membership and officers) and the specific protocol to be adopted regarding proxies being counted in establishing a quorum and in voting. She also pointed out that the committees specified in the bylaws were simply

Mr. Perez suggested that the entire Council serve as the Executive Committee and that offices of Vice-Chairman and Treasurer be established. It was also proposed that designated proxies be allowed to attend and vote on behalf of appointed Council members in the event they cannot attend. There was consensus to adopt these changes.

Dr. Easton asked if everybody was clear about the *bylaws* and there was agreement among the members.

### Selection of Chair/ Officers

Ms. Godbey called for nomination for the election of the chairperson. Mr. Perez was nominated, all those in attendance agreed, and no others were proposed. Mr. Perez was elected by acclamation. Mr. Perez thanked everybody for their confidence and Dr. Easton welcomed him as the Chairman.

## **3. Review of first Meeting**

### Clarification on Roles of Council Members:

Mr. Perez asked about Connie Mundzak because she was questioning if it were appropriate for her to participate on the Council. Ms. Godbey replied that she had talked to her and she is planning to continue to participate. Ms. Mundzak was concerned that she might not really be able to offer anything to the group. However, she now realizes that as a potential employer of trainees who complete the various adult and community education programs, she is a consumer of these services and stakeholder. Her input can certainly be built into a feedback loop which could guide what training is offered and how, as well as how effective the training is. This type of feedback loop necessarily requires representation from the diverse stakeholder groups. Since the stakeholder groups are too numerous to allow for representation from each, this process relies on the Council members to serve as a conduit of information between the many stakeholder groups that you come into contact with and the full Council.

### Evaluation of Process to date/ Dissemination of Minutes and Council Materials

The Council members generally expressed satisfaction with using email and the web page for communication. Mr. Hyle pointed out that the web page was very helpful and informative especially in getting minutes. Mr. Hyle suggested that each region have a web page in order to follow and compare their activities with other regions. Ms. Godbey indicated that this has already been established.

Ms. Godbey asked if anybody still did not have access to the web site and took their names in order to establish some other form of routine communication.

#### Review/ Adoption of Meeting Minutes:

Dr. Easton mentioned that he would like to make some modifications to the minutes. He would like the wording changed in one section on page three in order to stress that there are actually two aspects of the professional development arena to be addressed in this project:

- 1) The development of a regionally directed training system for Adult Education Practitioners; and
- 2) The policy changes that will need to be made to circumvent the obstacles in implementation that need to be removed.

There were no other changes requested to the minutes.

Mr. Michael McLeod suggested that there be an attachment to the minutes, like an executive summary, that just includes the most important points. Every body agreed to that.

#### **4. Old Business**

##### RPDAC Members Relay Constituent Reactions to Project:

Mr. Perez invited the RPDAC members to present their constituent reactions to the project. Dr. Easton also encouraged the Council members to express their own perceptions about the project and asked if there were any questions.

The major issue raised was the question of how ACE would fit into the project. Dr. Easton responded by indicating that the driving force behind this project is the attempt toward regionalization. The Regional Advisory Councils should take the lead in determining what training should be provided and how the region's resources should be used. Certainly, ACE with its experience could be Advisor to the Regional Council. Dr. Easton emphasized that there is no desire or intent to duplicate what ACE does in training.

Mr. Hyle pointed out that the training providers used by the Regional Councils could certainly include ACE but other providers could be employed to actually provide training, as well. Dr. Easton added that with the emphasis on putting the region in the "driver seat" the selection of training providers will depend on the region's needs.

Mr. Hyle added that recent Federal Legislation places greater emphasis on regionalization of the provision of adult and community education. In fact, Florida is currently requesting a one year planning period to make adjustments in the state plan. Subsequent to that, allocation of funds for training will be determined according to that.

Mr. Perez pointed out that he would get in contact with ACE to see where they can fit into this process. He indicated that he would encourage them to participate in the RPDAC meetings.

#### Discuss, Debate and Modify Process to Reflect Constituent Concerns:

Council members did not raise any other issues related to constituent concerns.

#### NATF Presents Needs Assessment Compilation for Feedback:

Ms. Godbey handed out copies of all the needs assessment compilations which project staff had completed. She pointed out that some of the compilations were more detailed than others. She added that the compilations include five local and five statewide needs assessments.

Ms. Godbey asked Eqbal Darandari, a project research assistant to briefly review the general findings of those assessments. Ms. Darandari indicated that the main needs that appeared were site-based inservice programs, and the main barriers were making provisions for part-time faculty to get training and insufficient funds to do this.

#### Discuss, Debate and Finalize Needs Assessment Design and Process:

Dr. Easton reviewed the scope of the ADE 21 project and pointed out that there are three primary stages:

1. Needs and Resource Assessment. As part of this stage we need to review the adequacy of the needs assessments that have been done to date, so we are not duplicating efforts. He emphasized looking at both NEEDS and RESOURCES, with the latter including the expertise and training abilities that exist within the region which can be used to address the training needs
2. Training. The next step is to deliver the training needed, making the best use of existing resources. The idea is to design these initial training sessions that will address high priorities and learn lessons about what works and what does not for the future.
3. Establish a *system* for Assessing Transfer of Training or how well the training is generalized to the instructional context and also how well the students' learned skills are subsequently applied in their own lives.

Dr. Easton pointed out that we are now into the first stage (*Needs and Resource Assessment*). In order to execute a meaningful needs assessment, it is important to consider the needs of adult education professionals from a systems perspective.

Dr. Easton used the figure found in the appendix to illustrate a systems view of Adult Education. The whole environment (Region 4, Florida) in which this dynamic exists is

called the *context*. He described the different elements and dynamics at play in that environment. On the input side of this model, administrators put together resources (RES) required to run a program; they get rooms/facilities, participants, trained people, and funds. The job of Administration is preparing those resources to get to the people providing the program (teachers, program directors). The program is the core of the system where actual teaching and learning programs are taking place. As a result of the program, people get new knowledge, skills and attitudes which are the immediate outcomes of teaching and learning. However, the ultimate desired outcome is the transfer and use of these in the person's job, family or other life skills areas where she or he might need that knowledge. This transfer stage is called *application*.

Dr. Easton emphasized that, in order to cope with the rapid changes in the field, we need to have a vision. We need to know, not just short-term, but mid-term needs for the next 20 years in region IV. These needs assessments should be conceived in the context of the broader trends. He said that *Work Force 2020* looks for economic and demographic trends. He added that there is a magazine called *American Demographic* that targets the social trends. He also mentioned that we need to plug into Department of Labor Documents to set the educational needs trends and population trends in the context of Work force trends.

Ms. Mavis Pacetti pointed out that in ESOL they really only have temporary trends not long-term trends. But she pointed out the need to teach administrators how to manage the quick shifting in the required skills.

In this context, providing professional development requires that a chain of reasoning be established that starts with “*What do Florida citizens (our concern) need in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?*” “What is happening in their environment and state? From that we derive what students will need to learn to compete in the workforce found in that context. From that we determine what our staff will need to know in order to address that. Then we must assess the available resources to make sure our staff can meet those needs: training, providers, availability of staff for training or availability of technology for training. Finally, we must ask ourselves what additional resources we can put to use in meeting those needs? Once the professional development has been implemented we must ask ourselves if that training improved the *impact* of the program?”

From this perspective, then, there are three criteria to be employed to evaluating the adequacy of a Needs Assessment:

- Have we done a good job of analyzing the demands (needs) for training? Have we considered the direction of region IV, not just what is happening now?
- Have we analyzed supplies appropriately (resources for training)?
- Have we succeeded in identifying obstacles that may stop us from filling needs with the available resources?

If any of these has not been sufficient in existing needs assessments, then we should consider expanding on the needs assessment information that is available. There was consensus that Region 4 could benefit from additional needs assessment.

Dr. Easton proceeded to describe a model that can be carried out in a short time frame but will render good quality information. This model would combine the use of an *Extensive Survey* with an *Intensive Survey* and then confirm and discuss information obtained from both through the use of focus groups or public hearings where you can present the preliminary results to the stakeholders and ask for their reactions and suggestions, as described:

1. The “Extensive survey” is sent to a lot of people - more than the user could talk to individually;
2. The “Intensive Survey” is administered to a small set of people – a number that the user could arrange to talk to in-depth; and
3. The “Focus Group” is employed to discuss and clarify the results from the two methods before.

Through this method we accomplish what is called “triangulation” because we will get data from three dimensions and will get a better understanding of the consistency or inconsistency in findings. In this regard, we increase the validity, reliability and ultimately the USEFULNESS of the results.

In order to carry out this type of model, Dr. Easton proposed a method, called “cluster methodology,” that the Council members could implement themselves and still be able to come up with the results by the end of March. This included the following steps:

- RPDAC members get a sense of what is needed for a needs assessment and what is missing from available information.
- The FSU team will come up with a proposed survey instrument and send it to Council members for their reactions, in light of their review of the existing needs assessments.
- The FSU Team will then modify that instrument and send it back to Council members.
- Each Council member will identify 6 - 7 people that she/he could get in contact with and administer it to, as well as follow up to clarify any remaining questions with those respondents.
- The Council member will then ask each of those respondents to send it to an additional 6-7 associates to complete and return it to those initial respondents.
- The FSU Team will then compile all of this information to present to the Council for consideration.

Ultimately, the Council will draw conclusions, prioritize the identified needs and develop a plan to respond to those needs. However, afterward this mechanism, or network, is still in place to be used again whenever it is needed.

Mr. Perez expressed his agreement with this proposal, given the time limitations for carrying out the assessment.

Dr. Easton proceeded by asking the Council members to think of how they would disseminate the survey, to whom they will give it, and to whom those respondents would subsequently give it to. He emphasized that they would work toward the MAXIMUM VARIABILITY among respondents with the limited number who are surveyed.

However, the members were concerned about how to ensure representation for each sector in region IV regarding the function, geographic area, populations, etc. Dr. Easton affirmed that one of the functions of the Council members is to routinely review representivity of the group and their activities. However, he pointed out that this exercise could serve also as a vehicle for bringing more stakeholders to the table to facilitate decentralization and reinvent the practitioner training system.

Members gave different suggestions on how to ensure representation from different groups and programs. Ms. Marilyn Martinez suggested using a Matrix, putting sub groups in different cells, to assess representation among the sampling of respondents. Dr. Easton pointed out that we need to balance between the external surveys and the internal surveys.

He proceeded to facilitate the definition of the necessary various respondent groups. The group delineated five dimensions along which to assess our sampling of respondents: Program Types, Program Populations, Providers, Geographic Representation, and Beneficiary Class. The group also enumerated what would be included along each dimension, as follows:

Program Types - ABE, GED, ESOL, Adult High School, Family Literacy  
Program Populations – Corrections Inmates, Migrant/Seasonal Workers, Nursing Homes, Adults w/Disabilities, WAGES, Workforce Development  
Providers – District Schools, Community Colleges, Private Voluntary Organizations or CBO's, Corrections, Technical Institutes, Department of Labor  
Geographic Representation – Urban, Rural  
Beneficiary Class – Teacher, Administrator, Student/Family, Employer

It was the consensus of the members that the FSU Team would draft this matrix and send it to the members who would provide feedback. Then the members would complete the matrix, the FSU Team will evaluate the representativity and then FSU will draft and disseminate the questionnaire for administration by Council members and their respondents. Some members were concerned about the difference between populations and populations' needs in the matrix. Dr. Easton clarified that the matrix will include different dimensions so that all of that can be addressed.

One Council member expressed concern about whether to include Vocational Education. Mr. McClung reminded the group that the project's funds are paid through Adult Education, so everything really needs to be tied to Adult Education.

Mr. Perez asked if there were any other questions and if everyone understood the next steps? Some members asked if they would receive further instructions. Dr. Easton assured them of that. He Committed to disseminating the **matrix for their review, through the web site, roughly no later than a week from this coming Monday**

#### **4. Close Meeting**

Mr. Perez adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m. Mr. Perez questioned the scheduling of the next meeting. Ms. Godbey pointed out that given the work plan that was laid out at the first meeting, and the schedules provided by the Council members, the best times for the next meetings would be on the 26<sup>th</sup> of March and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April. In May and June the Council will not need to meet because by the end of April the members will have identified training priorities set for region IV and there should be training sessions in process. So after, April, the Council does not need to meet again until the training process and products have been evaluated. Mr. Perez reiterated that the next meeting would be March 26 at Manatee Community College.

APPENDIX

Figure. 1



