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LAURA CASERTANO: So I want to introduce today's moderator, Heather Fleck. She is the unit chief for the Governance Unit. Heather?

HEATHER FLECK: Great. Thank you, Laura, and thank you, everyone, for joining today. We're happy you could be a part of today's ongoing training we have in our regulation that we recently released with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Today I'm going to be joined by Cheryl Keenan. She's the director in the Division of Adult Education and Literacy in the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education at the U.S. Department of Education.

And we're going to be discussing some important provisions related to how local areas, local planning interacts with the Adult Education and Family Literacy grant competitions. So we're going to go over in some details the regulatory requirements as it relates to eligible agencies and the review of those applications by the local board. Cheryl will give some detail on the statutory purposes of Adult Education and the Family Literacy Act.

That will be more an educational experience for our labor side of the audience. I saw a good number of you are from the adult ed side participating. We'll talk a little bit about how eligible agencies must award their AEFLA grant funds, go over what's required of local boards, and clarify the administration costs related to the alignment of these entities.

So before we turn it over to Cheryl to discuss in more detail the AEFLA, the Adult Ed and Family Literacy Act provisions, want to remind you all sort of why we're here, what the vision for WIOA. And we're reminding people of this in all of our trainings because we feel like it is important to keep emphasizing this.

So the critical hallmarks of excellence that are articulated in the law is that the needs of business and workers drive workforce solutions. One-Stop centers, or as they're now branded, American Job Centers, should provide excellent customer service to all jobseekers and employers and focus on continuous improvement. And we want the workforce system to support strong regional economies and play a very active role in community and workforce development. So across all this the improvement is – needs to be supported by evaluation, accountability, identification implementation of best practices, and using data to drive decisions.

The critical themes we feel like this connects to today in terms of today's presentation are partnerships, what the partnership is, could be, and provisions that relate to partnering at the local level, particularly among the workforce side and adult ed side, and ways that can promote integrated service delivery.

So next, I'm going to cover the key local board functions that are articulated in the law and statute related to the topic today. So this is taken from the language in the regulations, and this is in the Department of Labor only rule. As you know, there are about five different rules, but this is in the Department of Labor only rule at 20 CFR 679.370(n) and it's also the exact same language that appears in the statute.

And the requirement is that local boards must coordinate activities with education and training providers in the local area, and this does include reviewing applications to provide adult education and literacy activities that are provided under Title II of WIOA for the local area. And those local boards are expected to make recommendations on whether those applications that are submitted by the adult ed providers who are competing for grant funds, whether they align well with the local plan. So that's the critical thing that we are talking about today.

A key piece that you need to be aware of is the timing and sequencing of how all this works out. So importantly, the requirement for alignment of local plans in AEFLA provider applications can impact the timeline for when a local plan should be written and approved by the state because the only way an AEFLA provider can write an application that is consistent with the local plan and aligns to it is if that plan is available to them and it's been approved by the state.

So even though the law doesn't actually and the regulations don't either provide a deadline for local plans, sort of the requirements of WIOA do put into effect a sequence of events that need to happen in order for that alignment to occur. So the approval of the plans need to be in place first before the adult ed – the state can run its adult education competitions and before the local board can do its part in terms of providing recommendations on the alignment of those applications.

But a critical factor here is that the Department of Education last year released a program memorandum that provided that the adult ed competitions need to be completed by July 1st, 2017, and that for them was a delay in when the competitions would normally occur. So those are the important dates you need to keep in mind in terms of how these things fall out in order.

And now, Cheryl Keenan from OCTAE is going to discuss more – in more depth what the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act is all about and specific requirements around the competition itself. So, Cheryl?

CHERYL KEENAN: Thank you, Heather. Good afternoon, everybody. It's my pleasure to be with you today. I'd like to take time to thank Heather and all of my colleagues in the Department of Labor for working so closely with us on what we think is a really important provision in WIOA.

Before I start my presentation, we got a little poll question for you, and we would like you to register a response related to which statement best represents my state's coordination efforts to date to align with the AEFLA competitions and the availability of approved local plans. You have four choices in there. It would be really great to see where everyone is at at this moment in time.

We have a great group of people on the phone. Right now, we're still voting, voting. It's going up, up. This is wonderful. We have – oh, it's changing on me. Voting closed? So it – we're showing that we have 51 percent of the folks who have registered to vote say that their state has coordinated a timeline that allows for awards of AEFLA grants to be done by the July 1, 2017 date, and we have another 30 percent of states that are working towards a timeline that will allow for such.

We have less than 1 percent of states saying that they've determined that they cannot align the approval of the local plans to allow an award by July 1 of 2017, and we have almost 19 percent of responses saying that the state has not yet begun to consider the timeline. So I think that we are moving along as a country on this very important provision, and thank you for that great information that you provided.

I wanted to take just a few minutes, as a way of background for the folks on the phone who are not working in the adult education program, to note that for us the reauthorization of WIOA is a part of a rather lengthy legislative history in – of adult education that dates back more than 40 years.

Interestingly, the very first adult ed legislation was under Lyndon Johnson's administration and an important part of his war on poverty, and even back then in the '60s adult education was recognized as being a very important part of self-sufficiency and employment of individuals who were living in poverty.

And today that still remains a main purpose. I'm sorry. My thing was jumping around. Overall, the WIOA has maintained that important purpose to improve literacy, skills, and knowledge for employment and self-sufficiency, and over the years they've paired it with some additional purposes, one being recognizing the importance of education in the development of children and success in children's education. This is very sensitive.

A long-standing purpose has been to help individuals who have not had the opportunity to obtain a high school credential to actually get a high school credential. And in this reauthorization, Congress was very purposeful to note that high school in itself is not enough, but the purpose is also to help adults to transition to postsecondary education and training through the use of career pathways.

And then lastly, this authorization has also formalized a long-standing purpose, which is to help immigrants learn English and understand the American system of government, individual freedom, and the responsibilities of citizenship.

Another interesting piece of history is that under our authorization of WIA in Title II, that the adult education program did not work under regulations and, in fact, hasn't had regulations in the field of adult education since the mid '90s. Under this authorization under WIOA, we did choose to regulate on Title II, and today I noted some key areas that we will be talking about.

In our regulations we took the opportunity to describe how states must make awards and how states must implement this new requirement that Heather talked about for local board review of AEFLA applications. I'm also going to speak briefly about a piece of local administrative funds because it's very important to the alignment with local plans. We also regulated how eligible agencies can demonstrate effectiveness in the application of these funds. That will not be a topic of conversation today.

In making awards, just some more by way of background, my department, Education, allocates appropriated funds to state eligible agencies that are designated under Title II. The term of state eligible agency is an important one for us to all identify with. These are the individuals who serve as our state adult education offices across the country, and these state eligible agencies vary. The majority of states, they are housed in state education agencies. Some are in postsecondary institutions or agencies of some kind, and a smaller number are in workforce or labor agencies. So depending on where you live, your state eligible agency may be a different type of state agency.

When we provide these funds to the state eligible agency, they must in turn award funds on a competitive basis. So the basic requirements for states is that they must award competitive multi-year grants or contracts to eligible providers, and eligible providers are basically any organization of demonstrated effectiveness. And those grants must be to enable eligible providers to develop, to implement, and to improve adult education and literacy activities.

Now, when states are conducting this competitive process, that process must also ensure that all eligible providers who are applying for Title II adult ed funds have what is referred to as direct and equitable access to apply and to compete for these grants and contracts.

And that means basically that there can be no pass-through to a sub-state agency, that the applications must come directly to the eligible agency and that that eligible agency must use the same grant or contract announcement and the same application process for all eligible providers. So things cannot vary so that there is one type of organization for a community college and another type of application for, say, a community-based organization.

Now, in making these awards, the eligible agency must require that the funding is used to establish or operate programs that provide adult ed and literacy. And in our most recent authorization under WIOA, there was a new language added to that, which I underlined on this slide, that it must include programs that provide such activities concurrently because you know that co-enrollment, career pathways, and many of the other tenants of WIOA are – it's important for multiple partners to engage in these sets of services.

OK. In awarding these grants, the statute actually requires states to consider certain things. Under WIA there were 12 factors that states had to consider in scoring these applications, and WIOA somewhat revised the 12 factors and adds one new important one, which is the topic of our discussion today.

In terms of the 12 factors that have existed under WIA or have been revised slightly under WIOA, they generally consider such things as past effectiveness, the intensity and the quality of services, the qualifications of instructors, the extent to which that applicant coordinates with a variety of different services in the community, the use of technology, the use of research-based practices, and other things of that nature.

And one new consideration was added which directly relates to the board function requirement that Heather previously reviewed, and that is the extent to which the eligible provider demonstrates alignment between proposed activities and services in that application and the strategies and goals that are listed in the approved local plan.

OK. Polling question. If you could please register which statement best represents my state's coordination efforts on local board review of AEFLA applications. You can say that the adult ed office and the state workforce board are in the process of determining how these reviews are actually going to happen. You can say that those two offices have already finalized the procedures for how that's going to happen, or you can say that those two offices have not yet started discussions about the processes for how the local board reviews will occur.

OK. We have almost 66 percent of our respondents saying that these processes, that you guys have talked it through and you have already determined how those local board reviews will occur. We have a very small number saying that – oh, I'm sorry. Yes. I'm mistaken. We have 64 percent saying that they're in process of doing it. We have 7 percent saying that the boards have actually finalized these procedures, and then we have close to 30 percent of our respondents saying that these discussions have not yet begun.

So I think for those individuals who are in the midst of these conversations or those who are not yet started, hopefully this webinar will give you some ideas about the substance of those conversations. And for those who have finalized them, it will be a validation process to be sure that the procedures that you have developed are indeed ones that are acceptable under the legislative requirements.

OK. So the next part of this webinar is really about the regulation that's found in 34 CFR Part 463.21 because, as I said earlier on, we chose to regulate on certain aspects of WIOA in Title II, and this one being so new and presenting such a tremendous opportunity to further the alignment of the core programs of adult education in the One-Stop delivery system and with the local plans, that we believed it was important to do some regulating in this part.

As we developed this rule, the real purpose or real motivation in creating this portion of the rule was to ensure that we had uniform procedures within a state for the local board to review an application and to really ensure that the state adult ed agency or the eligible agency was actually using that review and considering that review in its decisions about awards of grants and contracts for adult education and literacy activities.

Given the provisions for same process and direct and equitable and fair and open competitions that adult education is required to follow, it's very important that the board reviews are conducted in a uniform way and that those results are used in a uniform way for competition to really be a valid competition. And we also have the goal understanding the differences among states to make sure that we were providing flexibility to the states in how they were meeting the requirement.

So the rule in Section 463.21 has three parts to it, and part (a) really requires the state adult education office, the eligible agency to establish within the competitive process how the local board review will occur. Transparency here is very important so that any and all applicants, anyone who is interested in applying for funds have the same information and the same opportunities for competing for these funds.

So transparency in the competitive process up front, letting applicants know what the procedures were going to be in that state for the board review are very important, and we believed it was important to establish that the eligible agency must really clarify this in the competitive process up front in their RFPs.

Of course the rule carries with it an implicit requirement that the eligible agency is working with the state workforce board to establish these procedures. I think everyone would agree that it would not be optimal for an eligible agency to create procedures that involve local boards without having conversations with your state board to ensure that those procedures are sound and efficient and can be carried out.

Further, when the state develops this process and clarifies it in its competition, the rule further addresses what must be included in the process, and that is that the submission of the applications to the appropriate local board for its review for consistency with the local plan names the appropriate timeframe in which that has to happen. So the process has to actually address the submission of those applications to the board for review.

And in this piece we are encouraging states to develop a process whereby the eligible provider would submit its application directly to the state adult education office and that the state adult ed office then would submit these applications to the appropriate local boards and the local boards would return the review results back to the state adult education office for consideration in the funding decisions. We think that this would be a best practice and a very efficient one, although we also understand that states have flexibility to develop other processes that would need to consider the appropriate quality control.

The process must also provide an opportunity for the local board to make recommendations back to the eligible agency to promote alignment, and the requirement in the rule is also that the eligible agency is required to consider the results of all of that hard work that the boards have done in determining the extent to which the application addresses the required considerations in 463.20. So we have the state eligible agency who's required to create that process up front and the process having three critical elements that are outlined in the slide.

I've also excerpted a few preamble discussions because we did receive a lot of comments when we had the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking out. We received a lot of comments on 463.21 and on the general requirement for boards to review adult education applications. This statement from the preamble discussion that I pulled out was in response to some comments that were recommending to the department that we write into the rule that alternate bodies could be used instead of the local board review.

And this has also been a common question even since we have published the rule. The preamble statement clarifies that the final regulations ensure that all applications within the state are treated in the same manner in the local board review and that the act explicitly requires local boards to review the application and that, as the department, we were unable to include in the regulation any alternative review process that would eliminate the requirement for the board to review. So if there is a state advisory board for adult education or some other body, that body may not substitute for the local board review.

The next – I'm sorry. The next part of the preamble discussion is related to some comments that we received to add to the regulation to create a role for the state board in the local review process, and some of this was out of concern from boards about enforcing conflict of interest provision. In the response in the preamble we have clarified that an additional requirement for the local or state board to review preliminary funding decisions by the eligible agency would diminish the authority of the eligible agency provided in the statute.

The eligible agency has the flexibility to determine its application review process consistent with Title II requirements, including how grant or contract applications are reviewed and in providing safeguard measures to facilitate objective review and to avoid conflict of interest.

So these are the two things that we have kind of pulled out in this section, and this is the main part of what we are presenting to you today. I do have one additional provision that is an important provision that's not directly related to the board review, but it is related to the coordination of services and the operation of the One-Stop and supporting the infrastructure costs of the One-Stop that may be a little different than other core programs. And under the Workforce Investment Act there were four things that were explicitly mentioned in the act as being allowable under local administrative costs. And they were planning, administration, personnel development, and interagency coordination.

In this round under WIOA, what basically happened is they took that bullet on interagency coordination and they became much more explicit about the uses of local administrative costs in these local adult education grants or contracts in saying that local administrative costs may include providing adult education and literacy activities in alignment with local plans and in carrying out One-Stop partner activities, including contributing to infrastructure costs of the One-Stops.

OK. A polling question, if I can advance the slide. OK. If you can select which of the following statements best represents my state's discussions related to local board review of AEFLA applications, and the choices are my state is discussing communication strategies to make local boards aware of the requirements for the local board review of AEFLA applications or my state is discussing the training and technical assistance needs of the local boards to help to prepare them to meet this. Three is we're doing both. Four is we're doing neither. Some food for thought.

Voting. Voting. Very good responses. You have to scroll. Great. We have the majority of respondents indicating that they are doing both. And we have about 11 percent saying that we're talking about the communication strategies, and we have about five percent saying we're talking about training and technical assistance needs. And we have about 37 percent who say we haven't started any of these conversations yet.

I think what's really important to know is that as you progress in this planning, these are two very important conversations to have between the adult education state office and the state boards. Preparing the locals for the review, talking about the communication strategies so that local boards are aware of these requirements are things that will help to promote a successful review and application process.

OK. That concludes the presentation part of our presentation. Heather, do you want to start advancing the slides because they won't behave for me?

MS. FLECK: Sure. Thanks so much, Cheryl. So the remaining slides really just point out some resources for you in terms of the law and exact regulatory citations for you to consult as you work through this process. I too am having a few problems. OK. And here's the key regulatory citations we covered today, and then in addition both Department of Education and Department of Labor will be issuing additional information to our systems.

There is a program MO, that we mentioned earlier in the presentation, from last year that the Department of Education issued to its grantees related to the competition and the extension to a later date, which is coming up – just the date coming up now. And then Department of Labor, we will be issuing a Training and Employment Notice that will cover a lot of this territory and some other things as it relates to local planning, and an additional program MO will be issued from the Department of Ed clarifying some of these points as well.

So keep an eye out for those, and of course you can go to your – for Department of Labor, your regional office contacts with any questions you may have, and for the education side, your normal contacts at the Department of Education.

MS. KEENAN: Right. And I might add that on our guidance that is pending on the competition and award of AEFLA funds, we issued that on December 8th with the requirement for a July 1, 2017 date.

And since that time we are becoming aware that maybe a few states might be having problems aligning the competition requirements with the availability of the local plans, and we are working on issuing a second program memorandum on the competition and award of AEFLA funds. In the meantime, if any state has identified the fact that they are unable to have local plans available and run a timely competition for AEFLA that would issue the grants and awards on July 1 of 2017, they should contact my office.

You can send me an e-mail. The state director can send me an e-mail, or you can contact your area coordinator.

MS. FLECK: OK. Well, I think we're ready to turn to questions now, and you can type in your questions into the chat window. But we do have a few that have come in already. There is an individual asking about the status of California in this, and without going into too much detail on this webinar, I believe those discussions have been underway.

MS. KEENAN: Yeah. And I might say that I think that California is a wonderful model of collaboration, and I know that they are actively working together to create a competition and local plan approval process that will result in highly coordinated services. So I think they in many ways serve as a model for other states.

MS. FLECK: Great. Our next question we have is, "How is the local board determined?"

So there's a section 107 I think of – 106 or 107. I'm sorry. I can't remember at the moment which part of the law covers the local board. But the chief elected official of a local area is responsible for making appointments to local boards, and there are very particular membership requirements for those boards that must be followed.

It has an assortment of business, business majority, and then individuals that represent the core programs, as well as workforce entities, such as non-profits and education providers, as well as organizations that represent labor unions. So it's the chief elected official that makes those decisions, and there are some nomination processes that are also required for certain appointments from appropriate organizations. So I would refer you to both the law and the Department of Labor regulation for those specific requirements.

MS. KEENAN: So we have another question, "Is U.S Department of Ed going to work to get funding allocations available to the states in a more timely manner in order for the states to accept the applications and then have the local boards review them prior to the beginning of a new fiscal year?"

Our intent of course would be to give you a timely allocation memo as possible. I think we all have to remember that, in order for us to provide the allocation to you, we need a budget, and we are in an election year.

So depending on what Congress does with continuing resolutions and budget passage, we need to have Congress act for the fiscal year prior to us being able to provide those allocations. But we are certainly aware and understand the need for timeliness in this competition, and we would work, to the best of our ability, to get those to you as timely as we could.

MS. FLECK: Great. Here's another question. I'm not sure we can totally successfully answer this today. "If a local workforce board wants to compete for a grant, would it review its own application for funding?"

So I think there would certainly be significant concerns there around conflict of interest, but, Cheryl, I don't know if you tell us if there are any requirements in terms of the type of organizations that may compete for adult education funds.

MS. KEENAN: Right. And so a lot of times I think it's nomenclature, but I don't understand how a board – I mean, the definition of a board is a group of people who come together to serve the functions of a board. So I'm not sure how a board could be an organization of demonstrated effectiveness.

So I always stumble a little bit in answering that question because an applicant has to be an organization of demonstrated effectiveness, meaning they have to have a – and there is a definition of demonstrated effectiveness in the regulation that requires a track record against the indicators of performance. And so maybe the question is more of can a – I mean, I don't – so I guess I'm not understanding the question. So I'm not able to answer it because I don't know what you mean by can a local board provide – be an applicant. Sorry. That's not clear.

MS. FLECK: Thanks, Cheryl. The next question we have is, "How does all this apply to single-area states with no local boards?"

So that's a good question. So there are about I think 10 or 11 states who don't have any local areas. They only have a state workforce board. However, the law does require that in a single-area state there are local function – there are functions that would normally be carried out by a local board that those states must assume.

So that role should be assumed instead in those states by the state board, but yes. Particular discussions will need to be had about how that process might look in those states. So if there are follow-up questions that the Department of Labor and Education can help resolve, please feel free to pass those along.

Next question, "Can the workforce development board director be the local board reviewer, or does the review have to include several board members?"

So I can tell you there's no Department of Labor sort of rule or regulations around this. We didn't – we think the local board can figure this – for the most part, figure this out on their own, but the decisions, the recommendations, regardless of who in the local board does it – and it could be the staff to the board. Regardless, there should be some sort of formal kind of recommendation that's made by the board to the state eligible agency. And, Cheryl, if you – do you want to –

MS. KEENAN: Yeah. No. We would have to go for – we would have to go back and take a look and provide clarification. So if you would like to present that question, you can certainly present that question to me or to your area coordinator, if it came from an adult ed place, or you could give it to Heather and she will forward it to me and we will try to get back to you on it.

MS. FLECK: Next, "For clarification, if the local board states that the applicant is not in compliance, what happens next?" And, Cheryl, I think that's for you.

MS. KEENAN: Yeah. So, I mean, let's be clear that the requirement is not – the requirement on the board is not to review for compliance or to review broadly. It's a very, very specific role to look at what the applicant is proposing and to provide comment or recommendations back to the state of how that could be strengthened. So the local board is not reviewing for compliance. You're reviewing for alignment with the local plan.

I think that one of the best practices that will – that may emerge as states develop their processes is for state adult education offices and state boards to come together and to create somewhat of a review form that points the board to the specific components of the application that need to be reviewed for alignment with the local plan.

So the board is not reviewing for compliance. The board is reviewing for alignment with the local plan, and the role is to make recommendations to the state. They provide that to the state, and the requirement is for the state to consider those recommendations in the overall scoring of the application.

MS. FLECK: Thank you, Cheryl. This next question is a lengthy one. The question is, "Are One-Stops required to have a WIOA Title II services available on site?" And this question says, "Our local WIB contracts out its services, mostly to non-profits. And should those One-Stops establish the partnerships, or should the workforce board establish the partnership to have the Title II representation on site?"

MS. KEENAN: Yeah. So the purpose of our – these are good questions, and I think that they're more appropriate questions to be answered through the training and technical assistance that we're giving on the One-Stops. So I'm not prepared to answer One-Stop and infrastructure cost questions today.

MS. FLECK: Thank you, Cheryl. And I would like to point out that there will be some forthcoming guidance that goes into more detail on the infrastructure and One-Stop competitions. We know there are a lot of ongoing questions around how the partners work within the One-Stop.

"Where can I locate the memos that Cheryl referenced?" I believe that that link is on one of the slides.

MS. KEENAN: Yeah. There is a link. The link for the program memorandum that is the December 8th, 2015 program memorandum that establishes the date is – the link is there in the slideshow, and it is also on our AEFLA landing page or our ed.gov site. The other memo that I referenced is in clearance, and it has not yet been published.

MS. FLECK: Great. Thank you. OK. Another question, "Let's say a local board has difficulty making quorum and does not take action in a timely manner. Is there a backup plan or wording that will assist with this situation?"

I am not aware. There's nothing in statute or regulation related to that situation. I think in terms of how the state eligible agency wants to deal with that, it would be largely up to them. But, Cheryl, if you have any – (inaudible) –

MS. KEENAN: Well, one of the reasons that we specifically mentioned within an appropriate timeline language in the actual rule is because we want it to be very clear to the boards what the response time is. If a local board did not return the application with comments to the eligible agency within the timeline, there is nothing that would obligate that state adult education office to hold up its entire award process based on that, and I believe they may choose to proceed without that board review.

But again, these are things that need to be discussed in the state, and states need to understand the flexibility that they're afforded in these procedures. However, I would say that it may not be possible to delay an entire competition if only a few boards did not respond to the timeline that was established in the process.

MS. FLECK: Right. And we do want to emphasize this is a critical piece of the changes that are made in WIOA to better support that coordination across programs and the alignment across programs. And I think the lack of – not doing a function that's clearly assigned is not a good signal for the positive relationships we're trying to form in WIOA. So I would just encourage the message to be the expectation that these are to be taken seriously and that they should be done timely.

OK. Next question, "What if a board member's organization applies" – I guess applies for the adult – "as an adult education provider? How would the board handle that review?"

So there are conflict of interest provisions related to – that you should pay attention to. These are in the Department of Labor rule, and particularly – it's not particular where money is involved. I mean, the local board in this situation is not the deciding agency about who is awarded grant funds.

They're simply making recommendations about the alignment, but we urge you to keep in mind whatever your state's conflict of interest policies are. And some local areas have conflict of interest policies so that if there's a perception of conflict, things can be done like recusing – that member could recuse them self from the recommendation process, for example.

And if there are – that's our last question, actually. I don't know if there are any others coming in. I see Laura is typing.

MS. KEENAN: It is 3:55. So I think we did well. We do really appreciate your questions and your participation.

MS. FLECK: All right. Well, I think – whoops. My computer just – I think that's probably it for it today.

Thank you all for attending this webinar. It will be available in a couple of days on our – on the ION website or WorkforceGPS, rather, so that for those folks that were not able to attend, they can hear that recorded version.

Also, I wanted to thank Cheryl and all of our colleagues at the Department of Education for our ongoing great partnership throughout the implementation of WIOA. Thank you all.

MS. KEENAN: Thank you.

(END)