



**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICY SPECIAL COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTICE**



**August 25, 2011
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

**777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

Douglas Sale, Acting
Executive Director

Mission Statement

“Our mission is to provide advice, counsel and recommendations to the full California Workforce Investment Board that improve Local Workforce Investment Boards’ ability to provide world-class services to constituents; and to provide overall strategic recommendations to the full Board in identifying the most critical priorities.”

The meeting will be accessible through webinar of teleconference. See below for details

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. Presentation - Future Work Systems, Inc.**
- 3. Action Items**
 - a. Approval of April 5, 2011 Meeting Summary
 - b. Approval of June 28, 2011 Meeting Summary
- 4. Update:**
 - a. State Board Meeting - Outreach Strategy Decision
 - b. Next Steps
 - c. Eligible Training Provider List (Community College and Approved Apprenticeship Programs)
- 5. Discussion**
 - a. Memorandum of Understanding (One-Stop Partners)
- 6. Public Comment**
- 7. Other Business**
 - a. State Board Actions affecting the Committee

Meeting information

Topic: Issues and Policy Special Committee

Date: Thursday, August 25, 2011

Time: 9:30 am, Pacific Daylight Time (San Francisco, GMT-07:00)

Meeting Number: 743 581 123

Meeting Password: cwib777

To start or join the online meeting

Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=170332187&UID=482999652&PW=NOTYxNzAwMWE2&RT=MiMO>

Teleconference information

Call-in toll-free number (Verizon): 1-866-748-2780 (US)

Attendee access code: 613 254 1

For assistance

1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/mc>
2. On the left navigation bar, click "Support".

To add this meeting to your calendar program (for example Microsoft Outlook), click this link:

<https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=170332187&UID=482999652&ICS=MS&LD=1&RD=2&ST=1&SHA2=9bJyDACZACctLm78ALtb9RI07xyo3ZqZtyfeQwyMlkU=>

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This WebEx service includes a feature that allows audio and any documents and other materials exchanged or viewed during the session to be recorded. You should inform all meeting attendees prior to recording if you intend to record the meeting. Please note that any such recordings may be subject to discovery in the event of litigation.

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

II. Presentation – Future Works Systems, Inc.

III. Action Items

- **Approval of April 5, 2011 Meeting Summary**
- **Approval of June 28, 2011 Meeting Summary**

Issues and Policies Committee

Issue Brief

Focus: “Develop Performance Dashboard”

Meeting Date: August 25, 2011

Background:

The California Workforce Investment Board and its Issues and Policies Committee have been working to determine what performance elements, beyond the 9 Workforce Investment Act Common Measures being used to report performance, are available, can be aggregated, and presented in a meaningful way to show how California’s workforce system is performing. Recent discussions at the federal level and among elected officials in California attest to the need to communicate a much broader and detailed narrative of our system’s successes.

[Future Work Systems](#) is a software company built from a successful merger between FutureWorks One-Stop Centers and a software development firm. The company provides information technology tools and services based on an application service provider model to workforce development professionals across the nation in support of US Department of Labor initiatives.

The presentation today will demonstrate their product and begin to provide the access to data to begin building this ongoing narrative.

Key Findings:

Recommendations:

**Issues and Policies Special Committee
Meeting Summary
April 5, 2011**

In the Chair's absence, Mr. Sedlik led the meeting. Introductions were conducted.

Members Present:

Audrey Taylor (by phone)
Barry Sedlik (by phone)
Adam Peck (by phone)
Richard Rubin
Felicia Flournoy (by phone)
Stewart Knox

Members Absent

Tim Rainey
Elvin Moon
Faye Huang
Jamil Dada

Staff

Daniel Patterson, staff to the Committee
Douglas Sale, Acting Executive Director
Luis Bermudez, staff to the Committee
John Williams, staff to the Committee
Adam Quinonez, staff to the Green Collar Jobs Council
Javier Romero, staff to the Green Collar Jobs Council
Moreen Lane, staff to the Health Care Workforce Development Council

Art O'Neal, Employment Development Department
Michael Evashenk, Employment Development Department
Loree Levy, Employment Development Department

Public

Barbara Halsey, California Workforce Association
Cheryl Moore, Ventura County
Denise Miller, Lake County OneStop

Updates:

Acting Executive Director Report

Mr. Sale provided an update on his discussions with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency on a range of topics: State Board membership and new appointments, work of the State Board, and appointment of new Executive Director.

The Agency is aware of all these issues but will not be acted on for several months due to other Agency and Administration priorities.

He also spoke briefly of the work of the Green Collar Jobs Council and Health Workforce Council. The next State Board meeting is scheduled for May 17th and the major item for the Board will be the action on the local area modification application.

Health Workforce Development Council Report

Moreen Lane gave the report. She provided a briefing on the history of the Council and its charge. Current efforts focus mainly on the activities of completing the requirements of the planning grant and readying for applying for the healthcare implementation grants. Those grants are estimated to be between \$3 to \$4 million dollars and will be available around October 2011.

Green Collar Jobs Council Report

Javier Romero reported on Green Collar Jobs Council (GCJC). He provided a briefing of the GCJC and its work to date. The principal efforts currently are the Regional Industry Cluster of Opportunity grants (RICOG) and the State Energy Sector Partnership (SESP) grants. RICOG is moving into the fourth phase of activity, which is sustainability. RICOG efforts are showing that job creation is dependent upon regional industry clusters and that RICOG demonstrates the alignment of resources to target those industry clusters. SESP is a \$6 million grant that leverages six regional initiatives. GCJC saw the first year as focusing on the supply side. The GCJC cannot take a scattered approach to training and needs to address demand now. For the demand side they developed the business resource catalog, which currently contain 120 entries. The GCJC is attempting to counter the image that the state is not business friendly, and the catalog will speed up development of green resources and resources that can be leveraged. The Master Plan has been revised and the Annual Report has been completed and both have been accepted by the members.

Doug Sale stated that the California Unemployment Insurance Code mandates that the State Board engage/develop sector strategies. These Council reports show reports show that we are making progress, first in the green economy and now the health sector.

Employment Development Department (EDD)

Michael Evashenk provided a briefing on the expenditure of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds in California and EDD efforts to ensure they are using them wisely: there have been legislative hearings held on this matter. Quarterly reports for the period ending March 2011 are due April 20th. The report will tell us where we are and what additional actions we'll need to take. He spoke of the federal efforts on the Continuing Resolution and their impacts on WIA.

If WIA subcontracts not issued by June 30th, a state budget impasse may affect the local areas receiving their funding. Expenditure reports for the quarter ending December 2010 are included in agenda package. Once March 31st data is received, EDD will make it available.

Art O'Neal gave a report of the EDD's efforts on the Workforce Services Network Project and the performance reports for the quarter ending December 2010. A discussion about additional data elements ensued. Doug Sale stated request was for absolute numbers (actual number served) as opposed to percentages.

Mr. O'Neal state will need to run new report format. Mr. Rubin stated it would be useful to know how we are meeting our goals. Mr. Rubin also suggested that perhaps greater sharing of data would be possible between agencies to create some efficiencies.

Mr. O'Neal replied that the new system will enable historical data to be much closer to real time data and are estimating a revised implementation date of the new system of June 30, 2012, perhaps a couple months earlier. Common data will be possible with a common system that is client centered and that there will be an improvement in data reporting. Ad hoc reporting should also be easier. EDD is forming committee to address issues and procedures that arise during the implementation phase. Mr. Rubin stated that the Issues and Policy Committee could serve as such a committee. Mr. Sale replied that as the system is implemented, the Board may need to get involved in policy development. Mr. O'Neal stated the committee would be dealing with procedures as opposed to statewide policy and the benefit of purchasing an off the shelf system is we get the service to restructure data elements as part of the contract. We are in much better shape with a multi-state vendor who can revamp the reporting requirements.

Action: Meeting Summaries

Mr. Sedlik asked for a motion to approve the three meeting summaries. It was moved by Mr. Peck and seconded by Mr. Sedlik. Mr. Sale recommended some changes. Nancy Crooks, interim executive director of North Coast Counties Consortium (NCCC), wants to amend summary to add sixth bullet in Mr. Sale's summary that NCCC is willing to keep Lake County in the consortium and mend the relationship, and add a discussion where Mr. Sale asked the Lake County supervisor where if move resulted in significant reduction in funds, would move still take place; the answer was yes. No objections to changes were made. Meeting summaries approved unanimously.

Updates:

Local Plan Modification

Mr. Patterson stated that state legislation requires the State Board to develop statewide strategic plan, separate from the WIA Plan.

The staff at the State Board is working with EDD to formulate language of the local plan modification document. The planning process is being moved forward by six months to facilitate having an approved plan to be in place at the beginning of each Program Year (July 1). Mr. Rubin moved the item be approved and Ms. Taylor seconded. The item was approved unanimously.

High Concentration of Eligible Youth Awards

Mr. Patterson provided an update on this topic stating the new American Community Survey (ACS) data would be used to recalculate the local area's eligibility to apply for the high concentration of eligible youth grants. There were some changes that will be made to the Draft Directive once we receive the data and the budgeted amount has also been reduced to \$500,000. Ms. Taylor moved to approve and Mr. Rubin seconded. The item was approved unanimously.

WIA State Plan Extension

Mr. Patterson stated the Department of Labor (DOL) granted states the opportunity to request an extension of the current state plan and waivers. This request is due to DOL by April 15th, 2011. Labor and Workforce Development Secretary has already approved the request which will be sent to DOL for their action.

Scope of Work

It was noted that Mr. Rubin has to leave and quorum will be lost. The Branding of the system was presented to the State Board in May 2010 who referred the issue to the Committee. At the meeting of the workgroup it was recommended that because of varied stakeholder's interests, a consultant be contracted with to assist in this effort. Ms. Taylor read through minutes of the Fall State Board meeting and thought we were not moving forward on this; branding is going on at the national level, and new management information system may be associated with branding. She stated that we need to showcase our work not spend our efforts on Branding as every local board already has its own local brand. Mr. Patterson stated that this effort was suggested as a part of DOL's recent review. Scope of Work requires the consultant to review other brands being used and develop a single brand for statewide use for workforce investment. Ms. Taylor stated that moving something forward when money is important needs consideration; she does not doubt that branding is necessary, but would like to check out the national effort. She is concerned we are moving forward on a solicitation in uncertain time.

Ms. Flournoy stated that the national logo is available (Workforce Investment Works), which she has put on her materials.

Mr. Dada has stated in the past that there is no national branding scheme envisioned in WIA reauthorization language and the National Association of Workforce Boards (NAWB) effort is really a one stop location for informing legislators.

Ms. Levy stated that it is difficult to showcase work when identification of the system is fragmented. Ms. Taylor asked how our efforts are any different than national efforts. Mr. Sale stated that main purpose for NAWB website is a depository of information and not designed as public portal to link up to one stop services. It is principally designed for elected officials to access information about WIA. The state effort is designed to link to one stop services and that the costs are negligible.

Ms. Taylor expressed concern that the State Board will not be prepared for this scope of work as they stated they were not ready to move forward. Mr. Sale replied that the State Board referred this to the Committee for more staff work and that Mr. Dada and California Workforce Association (CWA) are ready to move forward.

Ms. Flournoy stated that the NAWB campaign was more than to inform congressmen, but part of a national effort to inform the public. Mr. Peck stated that Mr. Dada said there is no contradiction between NAWB effort and state branding. Mr. Knox affirmed that now is the time with CWA on board. Mr. Sale confirmed that the State Board has funding in its administrative budget, but can postpone it for a few more months. Mr. Sale feels Agency probably will support.

Ms. Taylor stated it might be a good time for branding to coincide with the implementation of new management information system. Mr. Evashenk agreed. Mr. Sale stated that we needed to bring the full recommendation to the August 2011 Board meeting. Mr. O'Neal stated that the July/August timeframe makes sure it gets integrated in new management information system. Mr. Patterson stated that there is still a lot of work to be done by August 2011 even if the scope of work is approved at May board meeting.

Ms. Taylor stated she does not have a clear understanding of what we are going to do. What is it going to cost at the local level? What does it encompass? How does it tie into other efforts? Mr. Sale stated the consultant would help to develop cost estimate for implementation. Mr. Patterson stated it is a performance based proposal, and will confirm the costs and hours when proposals are received. Strategy is to tie to local one stops, have a single portal for workforce investment. Mr. Sale states he is budgeting \$50,000. Ms. Taylor stated if we take it to the Board we need a clear presentation of purpose, what we are going to accomplish, and what will be the cost and the support of local areas. Ms. Flournoy stated what Ms. Taylor concerned about would get spelled out by consultant. That is what NAWB did and recommend we move forward for for the solicitation to go out and present it to the Board when proposals are in. Ms. Taylor agrees but not clear on purpose. Why do we need to brand? Ms. Flournoy states one stops are best kept secrets.

No matter what the current logo is, it keeps getting confused with the unemployment office. Ms. Taylor asked if we want the State Board to have this same conversation.

Ms. Taylor stated the brand shows we are a workforce system and at the second level how do we actually promote that brand. Can we do this in phases? Ms. Taylor suggested three phases. First is looking for brand concept, the second is how are we going to use it, and the third is implementation. Mr. Sale stated the scope of work could list the deliverables under the phases. Ms. Levy stated it is really good to use a consultant to get expertise and guidance to get brand identification and how do you use it.

Mr. Patterson explained how the staff developed the scope of work but will do some additional work and come back to workgroup. Mr. Sale asked do we still want to put revised scope of work before May board? Ms. Fournoy agrees with May board meeting. Mr. Peck wants part of discussion at May board meeting to include Agency input.

Mr. Sedlik warned that anytime you start talking about branding you start talking about lobbying. The position needs to be in the context that an effective brand is the means to communicate to the public and is therefore a cost savings. Branding is a red flag. It smacks of self promotion. Have to be sensitive to how this is characterized. It must be presented in such a way to show benefits to the public. Mr. Sale stated we are trying to increase accessibility to system. Mr. Sedlik stated needs to be positioned that way or otherwise appears too self serving. Ms. Moore recommended that this is really more of an outreach strategy rather than a branding effort. Mr. Sale asked if the issue should be put before State Board in May. Mr. Sedlik confirmed. The item can still be brought forward after spirited discussion. Mr. Patterson asked that written comments from member be provided to him on the scope of work in anticipation of this Board review.

There was no public comment or other business. Ms. Taylor asked if there will be a full State Board hearing on the local area modification request. Mr. Sale explained there will be a full hearing and he expects Lake County and others to be there.

The meeting was adjourned.

**Issues and Policy Special Committee
Meeting Summary
June 28, 2011**

Members Present

Audrey Taylor
Tim Rainey
Stewart Knox
Jamil Dada

Members Absent:

Richard Rubin
Felicia Flournoy
Adam Peck
Barry Sedlik

Staff Present:

Doug Sale, Acting Executive Director
John Williams, staff to the State Board
Luis Bermudez, staff to the State Board
Shelly Green, staff to the State Board
Daniel Patterson, staff to the State Board
Ken Quesada, staff to the State Board
Jose Luis-Marquez, Employment Development Department (EDD)
Art O'Neal (EDD)
Michael Evashenk (EDD)

Public:

Barbara Halsey (California Workforce Association)
John Delametier (Proteus, Inc.)

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Sale opened the meeting in Mr. Dada's temporary absence. The Action Item "*Approval of the April 5, 2011 Meeting Minutes*" will be carried forward to the next meeting due to lack of quorum.

A copy of a new form that can be used during Committee meetings was briefly discussed. It can be used by Committee members to capture points of interest, questions, and items for follow-up or additional work for the Committee staff. Ms. Taylor supported the use of this form and how has it been used in the Green Collar Council meetings: a living document, to support the minutes, and capture key findings. All agreed.

Executive Director Report

Mr. Sale introduced a legislative report, which had been developed by staff, and was included in members' packets. He noted that three of the bills on the sheet directly impact the Board oversight of the workforce system. He stated that the actions proposed by the legislation can be implemented by State Board policy and asked if the State Board should be more active in putting forth policy to address the legislative issues. He clarified that he was proposing this as a preliminary discussion to determine if there should be a bigger discussion with the full State Board. The members discussed their concerns regarding the legislation, the process by which it was introduced and the role of the State Board in making public policy.

Ms. Taylor's initial reaction to the proposed legislation is it attempts to apply a one size fits all approach and may unintentionally have a negative impact on some of the smaller local areas. Mr. Sale said that some Board members are sponsors of this legislation and members of the Legislature, also on the State Board, hear these bills in their Committee assignments.

Ms. Taylor stated that the State Board needs to be included in the discussions and that the Board should be developing policies that help all parts of the system. She asked the question of how we communicate our role to the Legislature: to be proactive versus reactive to the proposed legislation and its impact on local boards. She also emphasized that it is important for the State Board to ensure the Legislature understands the constraints and effects (positive and negative) of their proposed legislation so effective public policy can be developed.

Mr. Rainey cited some recent examples of the Legislature making policy in the workforce system. He also provided some instances in which these topics had been brought up to the full State Board in the past but it failed to act.

Mr. Dada replied that the State Board was hampered from being involved in this area by the previous Agency and Administration. He is hopeful that this will change under Governor Brown and Secretary Morgenstern.

Mr. Knox concurred by saying the EDD had stepped into that role because somebody needed to provide the policy guidance. He mentioned that at a minimum this draft legislation has brought this conversation up again. He repeated the question: how can the State Board use its relationship with the Governor's office so the local boards can get behind and support these initiatives. Mr. Delamatier mentioned that the State Board needs to better align with the local community colleges to leverage their resources and capacity. He asked how we develop a statewide relationship/framework with the Chancellor's Office.

Mr. Patterson reminded members that this is exactly why the Issues and Policy Committee was formed: to discuss and develop good public policy for the workforce system.

Ms. Taylor suggested the following action items: (1) staff develops information pieces regarding impacts of pending legislation, (2) conduct a discussion at the next State Board meeting on what is happening at the federal level and what actions the State Board can take to effect this legislation, and (3) examine WIA for additional flexibility in developing programs/initiatives. Ms. Taylor suggested the possibility of forming a Special Committee on Legislation to advocate for California's workforce system or identifying half a dozen Board members to meet with the Labor Secretary to discuss the future role of the State Board. Mr. Rainey agreed, stating that WIA is still very much on the table for additional cuts and that at a minimum we should be speaking with the California Congressional Delegation.

Mr. Sale also reported on WIA reauthorization efforts underway and that agency had solicited comments from the various departments on the draft Senate bill. Mr. Sale will continue to work with the Agency Secretary to develop a road map for the State Board and solidify its role in supporting the Administration's initiatives.

Employment Development Department Update

Mr. Evanshenk reported on the expenditure levels for the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funding for the quarter ending March 31, 2011. He provided a handout of showing these levels by local area. He is very confident that all of the ARRA funding will be expended by the end of June 30, 2011. He also reported on the current year funding levels: formula allocations were reduced by about 13 percent and the discretionary fund was also reduced from 15 percent to 5 percent.

He reported that the transition to the new Lake/Napa local area is moving along smoothly. Mr. Luis-Marquez stated the Napa County Board of Supervisors has four agenda items they were voting on to effect the merger.

Mr. O'Neal discussed the March 31st performance reports followed by some discussion among members. He also reported that the new workforce system implementation is on schedule and fully expects it to meet the target date of July 2, 2012.

Outreach Strategy

Mr. Patterson reported briefly on the activities of the Outreach workgroup. They are being supported by EDD design staff. They expect to have the final recommendation ready for the State Board's meeting in August 2011.

Strategic Planning

Mr. Dada stated the Committee has done the work it was asked to do and asked if there was anything else to be done. Mr. Sale stated state law requires a comprehensive state workforce development plan be developed. This is in addition to the plan required by WIA. He stated that the target date for completing this state plan was the Spring of 2012. An internal draft currently exists, but this Committee would take the lead in formulating the final version.

There was no public comment or other business.

The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT

Item 4 Discussion

- a. State Board Meeting – Outreach Strategy Decision
- b. Next Steps
- c. Eligible Training Provider List (Community College and Approved Apprenticeship Programs)

Item 5 Discussion

- a. Memorandum of Understanding

Item 6 Public Comment

Item 7 Other Business

- a. State Board Actions affecting the Committee

Issues and Policies Committee Issue Brief

Focus: "Outreach Strategy Next Steps"
Meeting Date: August 25, 2011

Background:

At its August 16, 2011 meeting the State Board approved the Outreach Strategy and the proposed next steps to develop an implementation plan and timelines for logo/identity roll-out. These proposed actions are:

- Tools, policies, and usage standards to support system identification and brand management.
- A public outreach strategy for promoting the statewide system.
- Development of a stand alone website that will be a single point of entry to the system and information source.
- Outreach to other state agencies and local partners.

Key Findings:

Recommendations:



Issues and Policies Committee

Issue Brief

Focus: “Memorandum of Understanding”

Meeting Date: August 25, 2011

Background:

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) contain provisions regarding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

WIA Section 121(c) provides that local boards, with the concurrence of the chief elected official, shall develop and enter into MOUs between the local board and One-Stop partners. The section further provides that each MOU shall contain the following provisions:

1. Services to be provided
2. How the costs will be funded
3. Methods for the referral of individuals between the operator and partners
4. Duration of the MOU and procedures for amendment

A recent federal audit of WIA in California found that MOUs are not current and do not meet the statutory requirements outlined in WIA. There have been preliminary discussions between the Employment Development Department (EDD), Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Region 6, and State Board staff. The Issues and Policy Committee is being tasked to consider this matter and determine how to respond to the audit finding.

Key Findings:

Recommendations: