

WIOA Local Governance and Sectors Subcommittee

Date/Time of Meeting: Oct 12, 2015. 9:00-10:30 AM.

Location of Meeting: Labor Building, Columbia St.

Members Present: Jennifer Peppin, Dave Wallace, Carolyn McKinnon, Agnes Balassa, Jeanne Bennett, Caitlyn Jekel, Creigh H. Agnew, Mark Adreon, William Durden, Mark Mattke, Elizabeth Laukea, Annette Herup

Guests: Cheryl Fambles

NOTES

Creigh welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. She thanked the members for their participation.

Update and Review of Subcommittee Deliverables and Board Actions – Agnes reviewed the subcommittee deliverables and progress made toward meeting these. She noted that the subcommittee was scheduled to complete its work at the meeting, so no more meetings would be needed. Agnes also noted that the regions item was now in the Steering Committee and Board's hands. The subcommittee had completed its work. It was not yet clear exactly how the decision would be made. The Steering Committee and Board chairs would have to work out the specific roles and responsibilities of each group.

Action Item: Supporting Incumbent Worker Training

Discussion: A previous version of the table in the packet included Worker Retraining. The group agreed that programs was not incumbent worker training. The reason given for more investment into incumbent worker training is competitiveness. Most other states invest much more. The Board is emphasizing business engagement. Locals want more consistency in and access to incumbent worker training. Governor's discretionary funds are < \$2.5 million. The state may reserve up to 10% for statewide activities. That's about 5% for administration and 5% for all required and optional statewide activities. The Act says 15% but the budget only provide 10%. Anything not held at the state level goes to locals by formula. The decision on what to prioritize in the statewide activities pot starts with a meeting convened by governor's staff. The Board, ESD and WWA are included. The lack of resources is pervasive there aren't extra resources for job seekers either. A disjointed thru approach through various funding agencies doesn't work well either. It would be more effective and strategic one-pot of money administered by one entity with multiple access points. No matter the limitations on the pots, there should be no wrong door. If there are different agencies and pots of money you get wrong doors. Incumbent worker training funding should be aligned with local sector priorities. From a business viewpoint it is important for business to have someone they can go to to get all the answers. We don't need to know details, but know who to go to.

Members of the subcommittee supported the recommendation that incumbent worker training is a critical tool in business engagement and the state's efforts to increase business competitiveness. Members agreed that it was equally important to recognize that job seekers face some of the same challenges related to access to services that businesses do – they too need navigators and help accessing resources. Members liked the framing that no one should need a "magic code" to access services. Members commented on the disjointed nature of incumbent worker training resources. The subcommittee agreed to move the recommendation from the sectors task force forward with a couple of clarifications. The recommendation should include discussion of centralized resources available

throughout the workforce system so that a no-wrong door approach could be developed. Members also asked for the addition of language regarding alignment with statewide priorities, such as the Governor's sectors or locally identified sector strategies. Agnes will revise the final version of the recommendation and forward it to task force members for review before forwarding it to the steering committee.

Action: Adopted

Moved – Carolyn McKinnon.

Seconded – Jeanne Bennett.

Action: Approval of Recommendation for Sectors Rubric

Discussion: Agnes reminded the group that instead of adopting outcomes for sectors, a rubric would be developed that locals would use in their plans. Within the rubric, they can identify next step/outcomes/achievements. It becomes a learning tool for the field and state board and others as well, creates a common language and provides a way to share what is going on in the field.

The rubric presented was based on the model provided by SWWDC. Lindsey Woolsey, a national expert on sector strategies was asked to comment on the framework, based on her work across the U.S. Lindsey talked about the importance of preparing the team of local partners as the first step in developing a sector partnership, rather than just a sector strategy. She also suggested that evaluation happens throughout the process, rather than just at the end. The SWWDC rubric was revised to include 6-phases, adding a partner engagement phase at the start of the process. Phases 2-5 are exactly what SWWDC developed as part of the Columbia-Willamette Consortium, although language specific to the region's governance model was removed. A phase was added at the end to clarify that sector partnership are often iterative, leading to new phases of joint work as past phases end.

Jeanne Bennett reminded the group that this kind of work takes time - significant accomplishments do not happen early on. The group agreed that the rubric would allow for people in different phases of development to show where they are and set goals based on their status.

The group agreed that the metrics listed in the rows on the bottom of the page didn't feel right. There was discussion about the need to provide examples of the types of outcomes that result in each phase, but calling these accountability measures were didn't quite fit. The group talked about calling them process measures or sample outcomes. Agnes suggested 'expectations for this phase' with a request that the local provide examples in their plans.

Mark Adreon asked why Lindsey had added metrics to the model. Agnes stated that she had asked Lindsey which metrics made sense for each section, since the rubric was in lieu of identifying outcome measures. Lindsey suggested those on the rubric as samples, not as definitive. Lindsey's biggest recommendations were making sure that the local team of providers was well prepared to support sector partnerships, that the partnership among the businesses needed to form, and that sector partnerships should not be viewed as short term projects, but as a way of doing business.

Jeanne gave an example of how sector partnerships can drive change. The Columbia Willamette Consortium requested proposals to contract for curriculum development for certified production technicians, based on the needs of businesses. They found that all 5 community colleges applied together for funding, and are now all using the same curriculum, better supporting the business community.

The group agreed that the rubric would provide a consistent way for the field and policy makers to talk about, and organize their sector activities. The group agreed that Agnes would provide a revised version of the rubric for additional feedback and then forward it to the Steering Committee to adoption.

Action: Adopted

Carolyn-Moved

William-Seconded

Action Item: Recommendation Regarding Local Board Certification

Discussion: Agnes reminded the subcommittee that under the Act, LWDBs must meet the 13 functions of local boards as a requirement of their certification. She reviewed the changes proposed based on the last meeting. The Steering Committee had signed off on these. If the Subcommittee did not make any major changes, there would be no need to forward this item back to the Steering Committee.

There were no suggestions for changes except for sections 1.d.ii and 1.d.iii of the recommendation regarding the board membership status of non-profit. The Subcommittee members agreed with Agnes' assessment that the clarification of whether an organization belonged in the business or the economic development category should be based on whom the organization represented. Public economic development entities clearly fit in the economic development category. Private, nonprofit business associations and business organization may also serve an economic development function. The clarification is whether the entity is business driven or whether it has more of an economic development/planning focus.

The group agreed to combine bullet ii and iii and clarify that the test of whether a non-profit business organization fits into the business category is how 'businessy' it is. It will be up to the certifying group and the local board to talk this through when questions regarding business organization membership arise. The rest of the recommendation was adopted as written.

Action: Adopted

Jeanne: Moved

Mark: Seconded

Announcements: Creigh thanked everyone again and noted that there would be no further meetings of the Subcommittee.