

Memorandum of Understanding Extension

PRESENTER NAME: Eleni Papadakis

BOARD MEETING DATE: 3/23/2017

BOARD MEMBER SPONSOR NAME: n/a

DISCUSSION TIME ALLOTTED: n/a

<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: Governors can now grant up to an additional six months for local workforce development councils (LWDCs) to negotiate WorkSource cost-sharing agreements among at least 16 partner programs. The Board is asked to make a recommendation to Gov. Inslee regarding this allowance. LWDCs and administrative state agencies alike are in support of this extension.</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: All of them. Cost-sharing among all WorkSource partners is necessary to advance all aspects of new service models envisioned in TAP.</p>
<p>POTENTIAL IMPACT: Effect on people, businesses, communities. What is better or different from other existing strategies?</p>	<p>IT IS SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE: <i>see above</i></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: After reviewing the attached brief on this matter, the Board approves, via consent agenda, a recommendation that Gov. Inslee allow the extension granted by U.S. Department of Labor, with the motion provided in last section of this document.</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: See attached brief. Brief is in two parts. First section provides a summary of the issue and recommendation, and USDOL FAQ section provides technical details.</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: WDCs and state agencies that administer mandatory WorkSource programs all agree that an extension would be beneficial.</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: No cost.</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: The Workforce Board recommends that Gov. Inslee allows local workforce development councils (LWDCs) until December 31, 2018 to execute Infrastructure Funding Agreements (IFAs) to support WorkSource Center Operations. LWDCs should be required to notify the Workforce Board no later than October 1, 2018 if cost-sharing negotiations with any WorkSource partner are either stalled or unsuccessful, at which time mediation and technical assistance services will be provided. The Board further recommends that if after 30 days or by November 1, 2017, negotiations are still unsuccessful, Gov. Inslee will direct the Workforce Board to implement the State Funding Mechanism (SFM) articulated in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.</p>

