

Workforce Board Recommendation/Presentation

Draft *Talent and Prosperity for All* Review

PRESENTER NAME: Eric Wolf

BOARD MEETING DATE: 02/12/2018

BOARD MEMBER SPONSOR NAME: N/A

DISCUSSION TIME ALLOTTED: 1 hr

<p>ISSUE/SITUATION: Be concise - 1 or 2 sentences that get to the heart of the situation, problem or opportunity being addressed.</p>	<p>THE ISSUE/OPPORTUNITY IS: The Board will have the opportunity to review a draft update of the <i>Talent and Prosperity for All</i> plan. To enable submission of the plan by the March 15 federal deadline, the Board is asked to release the plan for a 30-day comment period before final approval of the plan at their March 14 regular Board meeting.</p>
<p>TAP STRATEGIC PRIORITY: Which TAP strategic priority or priorities does this recommendation support? Can you tie to specific goals and objectives in TAP? Briefly describe these connections. If the connection is unclear, describe why this is of consequence to the Workforce Board and/or workforce system.</p>	<p>SUPPORTS TAP STRATEGIC PRIORITY: The <i>TAP</i> update restates and reemphasizes the Board's four key strategic priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamlining Customer Service • Strengthening Business Engagement • Removing Barriers to Accessibility • Next-Generation Performance Accountability.
<p>POTENTIAL IMPACT: Effect on people, businesses, communities. What is better or different from other existing strategies?</p>	<p>IT IS SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE: TAP's two-year anniversary is an occasion to examine progress on the goals stated in the first edition of TAP, refine the system's goals if warranted, and recommit to the plan's overarching mission, goals, and objectives.</p>
<p>OPTIMAL NEXT STEPS: What do you really want to happen as a result of this discussion with the Workforce Board?</p>	<p>MY IDEAL OUTCOME OF THIS DISCUSSION IS: The Board members will gain an understanding of the substantive changes within the plan and will have an opportunity to ask questions about specific changes. Because of the tight time-frame before plan submission, the optimal next step is for the Board to release the draft plan for 30 days of public comment in advance of anticipated final approval at the March 14 regular Board meeting.</p>
<p>BACKGROUND: Short history of how this recommendation came to be. What has been tried, to what result? What evidence exists to support this recommendation?</p>	<p>RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) sets a four-year life cycle for state plans, with an exception that the first WIOA state plan be reviewed and reapproved by the state at the two-year mark. This two-year review and re-approval mark is an opportunity for states to assess what worked and what did not during their first few years of implementation, and to make adjustments to the first iteration of their state plan. States are not expected to draft an entirely new strategic plan with different goals and initiatives. The expectation communicated by both the</p>



Board and from our federal agency partners has consistently been that this update process is an opportunity for small-course corrections instead of large revisions. At the October 2017 meeting, the Board expressed confidence that TAP's goals were largely aligned with their current vision for the workforce system.

Recent guidance from federal agency partners confirmed a due date for the first 2-year update of TAP: **March 15, 2018**. Customarily, the Board has allowed the public to comment on a draft strategic plan for at least 30 days before submission. In order to accommodate a 30-day public comment period, a special Board meeting was scheduled for February 12. The 30-day comment period will allow staff at partner agencies and the Workforce Board to make remaining edits in advance of final approval at the March 14 regular Board meeting. Edits made during the 30-day comment period will be presented to the Board in March.

Index of Proposed Substantive Changes

Partner programs provided modifications to their portions of TAP over the first two weeks of February. Workforce Board staff has combined and reconciled these submissions into one draft document for the Board's consideration. Changes in the plan that are typographical or only update dates by two years have been integrated throughout the document.

In keeping with the expectation that this 2-year plan update would only incorporate slight revisions, most proposed substantive changes add either boilerplate language that did not appear in the previous edition of TAP, or update text to reflect evolving partnerships or program design. Staff has provided annotations on each substantive change proposed within the plan update, and catalogued these proposed changes on an Index (also attached). This Index has been designed to navigate Board members quickly to the page in TAP on which changes have been proposed.

The Major Substantive Change: Order of Selection

Board staff has identified one major substantive change to a partner program plan that will necessarily affect all partners and merits the Board's attention. In October 2017, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation elected to enter an "order of selection" protocol (OOS). State VR agencies may elect to enter into an order of selection when the demand of individuals seeking services outstrips the state's resources to provide them to all. Under an OOS, VR services are provided to those demonstrating the most need first; all participants are assessed by intake counselors and determined to exhibit one or more of seven possible "functional limitations to employment." "Functional limitations" are assessed in the following seven areas: mobility; communication; self-care; cognition and learning (self-direction); interpersonal skills; work tolerance; and work skills.

Under current state rules, three OOS categories exist as of February 2018:

Priority of Service Category	Criteria	Current Status
<p>1 Most Significant Disabilities</p>	<p>An eligible customer is assigned to Priority Category 1 if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You require multiple VR services over an extended period of time; and 2. You experience four or more serious functional limitations. 	<p>OPEN</p> <p>Priority Category 1 is open.</p>
<p>2 Significant</p>	<p>An eligible customer is assigned to Priority Category 2</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>



	<p>Disabilities</p>	<p>if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You require multiple VR services over an extended period of time; and 2. You experience one to three serious functional limitations. <p>Customers who receive Social Security benefits (SSI and/or SSDI) are automatically placed in <i>at least</i> Priority Category 2.</p> <p>A vocational rehabilitation counselor can assign these customers to Priority Category 1 after evaluating functional limitations, if additional disability barriers to employment are identified following a review of supplementary information.</p>	<p>Priority Category 2 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services.</p>
	<p>3 All Other Eligible Individuals with Disabilities</p>	<p>An eligible customer is assigned to Priority Category 3 if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You experience at least one functional limitation; and 2. You do not meet the criteria for categories 1 or 2. 	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>Priority Category 3 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services.</p>

Category 1 participants are prioritized to receive VR services first, whereas Category 2 and 3 participants are placed on a waitlist and must seek services from other workforce system programs. Approximately 6,000 system participants eligible to receive DVR services would fall into categories 2 or 3 and are likely to seek service from other partners in the system.

A new section within the DVR submission to this draft plan (**noted on the Index at Notation EW***) outlines DVR's OOS protocol and sets out *five* categories of OOS, instead of three. DVR is currently promoting a new role that would reset the number of categories at five. Final rules are expected to be issued before the summer. DVR staff believes transitioning from three categories of priority for OOS to five categories will allow for greater flexibility in delivering services to participants exhibiting the most functional limitation to employment. Under the proposed five category OOS structure, the eligibility criteria will be as follows:

Priority of Service Category	Criteria	Current Status
<p>Priority 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer experiences serious functional limitations in four or more of the following areas in terms of an employment outcome: mobility, communication, self-care, cognition and learning (self-direction), interpersonal, work tolerance, and work skills; and 	<p>OPEN</p> <p>Priority Category 1 is open.</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer requires multiple VR services over an extended period of time. 	
	Priority 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer experiences serious functional limitations in three of the following areas in terms of an employment outcome: mobility, communication, self-care, cognition and learning (self-direction), interpersonal, work tolerance, and work skills; and The customer requires multiple VR services over an extended period of time. 	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>Priority Category 2 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services, and released based on the date they applied for services.</p>
	Priority 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer experiences serious functional limitations in two of the following areas in terms of an employment outcome: mobility, communication, self-care, cognition and learning (self-direction), interpersonal, work tolerance, and work skills; and The customer requires multiple VR services over an extended period of time. 	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>Priority Category 3 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services, and released based on the date they applied for services.</p>
	Priority 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer experiences serious functional limitations in one of the following areas in terms of an employment outcome: mobility, communication, self-care, cognition and learning (self-direction), interpersonal, work tolerance, and work skills; and The customer requires multiple VR services over an extended period of time. 	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>Priority Category 3 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services, and released based on the date they applied for services.</p>
	Priority 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer is determined eligible for vocational rehabilitation services but does not meet the criteria for Priority Categories 1-4. 	<p>CLOSED</p> <p>Priority Category 3 customers are placed on a statewide waitlist for services, and released based on the date they applied for services.</p>
<p>At a future Board meeting, likely the March 14 regular meeting, the Board will have an opportunity to learn more about OOS and will explore how the system might develop or share tools to support partner programs serving Category 2 and 3 participants on a DVR waitlist.</p>			



<p>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, PROS AND CONS: Which stakeholders have been engaged in the development of this recommendation? What are the pros and cons of this recommendation? According to whom (which stakeholder groups)? Are there viable alternatives to consider?</p>	<p>STAKEHOLDERS HAVE PROVIDED INPUT AND THEY THINK:</p> <p>All TAP partner programs were consulted and invited to submit necessary edits to their respective plan sections via Track Changes. Workforce Board staff has integrated the proposed changes throughout the draft plan document.</p> <p>The Board staff wishes to thank the following programs leads and their staffs for their help responding to federal guidance: Gary Kamimura and Marie Bruin at ESD; Jon Kerr and Troy Goracke at SBCTC; Michael MacKillop at DSB; Michele Mulhern and Kristina Zawisza at DVR; Louisa Erickson and Michael Corcoran at DSHS; and James Helling, Carolyn McKinnon, Kaaren Roe, and Karen Dunn at Commerce.</p>
<p>FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND IMPACT: What will it cost to enact this recommendation? What resources will be used? Are new resources required? How much? Where will existing or new resources come from? Are there savings to be gained from this investment? Over what period? Are there other returns on investment to consider?</p>	<p>THE COST AND RESOURCE NEEDS OF THIS RECOMMENDATION ARE:</p> <p>Significant policy staff time at the Board has been spent coordinating and accomplishing necessary plan revisions, particularly in late January and early February. The Workforce Board Research Team also devoted late December to completing necessary economic and workforce data updates in the plan. Policy staff from partner agencies throughout the workforce system were called upon to update their respective portions of the TAP Operational Plan on an accelerated timeframe, given the delay of federal guidance on a submission date.</p> <p>There were no new resources for these efforts. Depending on the Board's chosen process, resources will be redeployed from other sources. Partner agencies and programs generously rearranged their workloads and staff priorities to accomplish this draft plan update in a timely manner.</p>
<p>RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS: What specific result do you want from the Board? Is this recommendation for discussion or action? If for discussion, will action be required at a later date? What next steps are expected after this discussion?</p>	<p>THE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR REQUESTED ACTION IS:</p> <p>Staff requests that the Board ask any questions they have about the draft plan update and then act to release it for 30 days of public comment before final action is taken on the draft plan update at the March 14 regular Board meeting.</p>

