

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL

Quarterly Board Meeting Minutes

Tuesday April 10, 2012

9:00 A.M. – 11:00 A.M.

PNC Bank

800 17th Street NW, 12th Floor

Washington, DC 20006

I. Call to Order

WIC Board Chair Michael Harreld called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m., and welcomed the WIC members and guests.

Board members present at the meeting included:

David Berns

Tynesia Boyea-Robinson

Robert Brandon

The Honorable Michael A. Brown,
(Kilin Boardman-Schroyer, Designee)

Tony Cancelosi

Lyles Carr

Bill Dean

Emily Durso

Jon Fernandez

Jonathan Gueverra

Michael Harreld

Cedric Hendricks

Victor Hoskins

Solomon Keene

Lisa Mallory

Kathleen McKirchy

Catherine Meloy

Sarah Oldmixon

Thomas Penny

Nicola Whiteman

Jos Williams

Marullus Williams

De'Shawn Wright

Board members not in attendance:

Joe Andronaco

The Honorable Kwame R. Brown

Bill Hanbury

Lori Kaplan

Barbara Lang

Laura Nuss

Carl Rowan

Neil Stanley

W. Christopher Smith, Jr.

II. Chair's Report

The Chair provided a brief overview of the Board's agenda and invited the Executive Director (Allison Gerber) to discuss the work undertaken by the Executive Committee since the January 10, 2012 meeting. Allison began by presenting two project plans regarding the development of One-Stop performance benchmarks and the evaluation of the current process for monitoring training provider performance under the Individual Training Account (ITA) voucher system.

1. One-Stop Center Performance Benchmarks

Allison provided an overview of the goals, objectives and timeline for establishing One-Stop performance measures. As laid out in the handout provided to the board, the work plan involved the following key tasks:

1. Review background information regarding and develop a short profile of past One-Stop system performance.
2. Review existing data regarding WIA and Wagner-Peyser service levels available and develop a profile of current monthly or quarterly performance of individual One-Stops based on existing data. Compare/contrast performance of individual One-Stops with overall system performance and DOL negotiated benchmarks for Program Years 2010 & 2011.
3. Review best practice information on One-Stop performance benchmarking from other jurisdictions.
4. Develop draft performance benchmarks and a quarterly reporting schedule for each One-Stop center.
5. Obtain stakeholder feedback regarding the draft performance benchmarks.
6. Develop final recommendations for the WIC board regarding appropriate performance benchmarks and any needed policy or program improvements.

Allison noted that the Executive Committee recommended that the Board prioritize the development of performance outcome measures for each of the DC Works Career One-Stop, as it will serve as a marker for the evaluation of the Centers One-Stop re-certification process. In addition, Allison stated that the benchmarking plan would also help inform the strategic planning process for the development of the five-year strategic plan due to the Department of Labor (DOL) in September 2012.

The timeframe for accomplishing the benchmarking project will be approximately April 2012 to July 2012. Thus, when the board reconvenes for the next WIC quarterly board meeting in July, WIC staff will present a set of proposed benchmarks for discussion.

Board Discussion and Q&A

One-Stop Staff Capacity: Tony Cancelosi inquired about the level of staff capacity to measure the quality of the One-Stop performance, and if DOES would be able to implement a benchmarking system once the recommendations are made. Lisa Mallory said that DOES would make every effort to work with the board to implement the recommendations and invited Board Members to visit the One-Stop Centers to get a sense of the roles and responsibilities of the centers' staff. Lisa added that the One-Stop centers have the capacity to report on outcomes. Allison also added that prior to making any recommendations to the board; WIC staff would be vetting its recommendations with DOES staff at various levels.

Scorecard: The board discussed the performance information already available through DOES, such as the characteristics of and the employment status of the individuals served through core, intensive and training services, and the timeline that it would require to set up a scorecard to that effect. Lisa indicated DOES can produce data that informs a number of outcomes, depending on the request and pointed out that the agency is striving to improve performance measurement. Allison continued by saying that DOES has data available that can be used to set up a scorecard. However, there may be additional information have to be captured in the future to effectively measure the One-Stop performance, which would initially take time to develop.

2. Evaluation of Individual Training Accounts (ITAs) and Training Providers

Allison gave an overview of the WIC plan for evaluating the existing contracting and monitoring processes for ITAs, as well as training provider outcomes. She outlined the following five objectives for the evaluation plan:

1. Develop an understanding of and document the current process for delivering training under the ITA system.
2. Obtain stakeholder feedback regarding what works and does not work as part of the current ITA process.
3. Develop baseline data regarding training provider outcomes to date.
4. Ensure we are complying with federal requirements regarding ITAs under the WIA.
5. Gain an understanding of best practices in using ITAs from other jurisdictions.

Allison informed the Board that the timeline for this project would be June – October 2012. WIC staff hopes to be able to provide the Board with project findings and recommendations at the October 12, 2012 quarterly Board meeting.

The Chair pointed out the importance of examining the way in which the current system engages training providers and the critical role the WIC would play in reviewing training provider performance. He then proceeded to ask if the Board was supportive of the proposed plan and if it was moving in the right direction. The board members indicated their support for the ITA project plan.

Board Discussion and Q&A

Current List of Training Providers: Lyles Carr asked if the WIC had a current list of training providers with outcomes available that can be shared with the board members. Allison noted that WIC staff would work with DOES staff to provide them this information.

Legislative Oversight and ITA Performance: Kilin Boardman-Schroyer noted that as part of the legislative mandate, the DC City Council (Council) asks DOES to report on ITA performance. He also suggested that the ITA information required by the WIC should be consistent with the information required by the Council. As such, the WIC and the Council should establish a coordinated effort to ensure that the reporting efforts are not duplicative. Allison concurred with Kilin's suggestion.

Performance Measures in ITA Evaluation: Sarah Oldmixon asked if the evaluation would focus solely on performance measures for training providers, or if it would address issues related to how training providers are chosen including targeted industry sectors or occupations. Allison responded saying that the project will look at the entire process for choosing target occupations and providers, as well as the outcomes achieved.

3. Draft Policy for Support Letters

Finally, Allison presented a draft policy governing the provision of letters of support for the Board's approval. Allison explained that, over the past few months, the WIC office received a number of requests from training providers requesting letters in support of their DOL grant applications. While in the past the District has provided letters of support on an ad hoc basis, it is common for workforce boards in other jurisdictions to establish policies and procedures related to the provision of letters of support. This policy will ensure that WIC will be able to evaluate requests in a uniform manner. In working with the Executive Committee to develop a policy, committee members felt it was important to

begin holding training providers accountable for job placements by asking them to report on outcomes as part of the request

As a result, the policy being recommended to the Board, would require organizations seeking a letter of support to provide information regarding the outcomes achieved through the provision of workforce development services or programming during the last year. In particular, the policy requires organizations to provide information on the number of participants enrolled, number of participants completing the sequence of services or program, and number of participants placed in a job, where applicable. Organizations may provide data based on the set of services and “year” that makes most sense (e.g., calendar year 2011, fiscal year, etc.) given the context of their grant proposal.

Board Discussion and Q&A

WIC Staff Capacity: Tony and Lyles asked about the quality expected from the letters of support and the investigative capacity of the WIC staff. In response to the staff capacity question, Allison introduced the new WIC staff member, Stephanie Tioseco, and noted she will help WIC staff with data analysis and evaluation. Allison also explained that after a certain period, WIC would be able to determine and establish a threshold placement rate or other clear metrics for meeting eligibility requirements. Until that point, she will work with staff to review the data provided and evaluate provider requests

The Chair noted if the board wishes to revise the policy, based on what is learned during the implementation phase, the board would be able to change it accordingly at a future board meeting.

Motion: Upon a MOTION made by board member Kathleen McKirchy and seconded by Catherine Meloy, the Request for Support Letters draft policy was approved and adopted as the official WIC policy for providing support letters.

III. Executive Director’s Report

1. Workforce Intermediary Update

Allison provided an overview of the status of the workforce intermediary and WIC plans for sector-specific work. She noted some of the top line recommendations from the Workforce Intermediary Task Force including:

1. *Core Activities:* Build upon existing workforce and education programs to promote a shared understanding of industries’ workforce needs; advance training that meets those needs; coordinate services for job seekers; and help employers find qualified job candidates.
2. *Target Industries:* Focus on brokering job development, training (aimed at both hard and soft skills development), and placement efforts in Construction and Hospitality/Retail industries should also consider further expansion in the Business and Professional Services/Information Technology industries, once the initial start-up of the other two sectors has been accomplished.
3. *Relationship to First Source:* While DOES administers First Source contracts, the intermediary can play a role in developing job opportunities for DC residents, and the WI anticipates a much wider range of business/public partners in its work in the targeted sectors.
4. *Governance:* The core functions and operation of the intermediary should initially be located within the DC WIC. The intermediary can provide oversight through the existing WIC board, whose membership includes broad representation of key partners and stakeholders.

5. *Program Model and Partnerships*: The intermediary should use its own staff, as well as partnerships in workforce development system, education institutions, training providers, unions, and industry advisory committees to carry out activities.
6. *Performance Metrics and Outcomes*: The intermediary should be guided by a set of performance metrics in keeping with the specific activities it implements for District residents and businesses. Measures should include metrics on outcomes for job seekers, businesses, and organizations.
7. *Budget and Funding Sources*: The intermediary should be funded in two phases. In Phase 1, the District should make an initial investment of \$50,000 for program development and seek a private sector match for up to \$25,000; in Phase 2, a mix of funding should be pursued to support a budget of \$1.6 million. This budget will be used to finalize the service delivery model and conduct a 9-month pilot program.

The Office of Policy, Legislative Affairs (OPLA) reviewed and submitted the workforce intermediary recommendations to the Council. Funding was identified in the Mayor's FY 2013 budget. And, Council will be holding a roundtable discussion surrounding the intermediary's work on May 17, 2012. If the Council approves the recommendations, the WIC will be seeking to hire a manager for the program.

Allison also mentioned that Bill Hanbury had volunteered to convene a hospitality sub-committee that would help shape the work on the Intermediary by engaging employers who can share some of the needs and requirements of hospitality businesses in the District. If board members are interested in participating in this committee, please get in touch with Allison or Bill,

For further information regarding the Workforce Intermediary Taskforce recommendations, please refer to Executive Summary of the recommendations included in the board's meeting packet.

Board Discussion and Q&A

Industry Sub-Committees: A board member asked if there is a sub-committee for the construction industry. Allison responded, stating that the WIC hopes to convene a subcommittee focused on the construction industry, but no plans have been made to date. She also noted she hopes to involve representatives from both union and non-union segments of the industry and asked the board to send her any recommendation or ideas.

2. State Plan and Strategic Planning

Allison discussed the requirements and steps in developing a state workforce plan for the District. She highlighted DOL's requirements for a state workforce development system plan. She also announced the September 15, 2012 deadline for submitting the final strategic plan to DOL. She stressed the importance of developing a clear vision for the broader workforce development system.

Allison also reported that DOL approved the scope of work around the board's technical assistance, which was discussed at the board meeting in January. And the board training and strategic planning session will be held June 4, 2012 training retreat.

Finally, Allison mentioned the possibility of the Mayor hosting a workforce development conference and said that she would keep the board apprised of any updates.

Board Discussion and Q&A

Private Sector Partnerships: Jon Fernandez asked if there would clear engagement points for employers who are interested in being involved. Allison responded that she felt that the board's private sector

members will be critical in shaping the strategic plan and that she would hope that the plan would identify a couple clear engagement points for industry moving forward.

Chair's Announcement: The Chair took the opportunity to announce that Jon Fernandez would be resigning from his position at the Federal City Council and relocating to Guam, to become the Superintendent for Education. Board members congratulated Jon on his new role.

IV. Presentations

1.) Brookings Institution, "An Introduction to Youth Employment Policies and Programs"

Martha began by presenting data, which illustrated the current educational profile of youth in the District. She noted the significant disparities in educational outcomes especially the high truancy rates and low high school completion rates, emphasizing that the community is losing youth at multiple points in life trajectories and that DC youth and young adults are falling behind. Most notably, 10,000 low-income D.C. youth are not in school, are unemployed, or are not in the labor force. She concluded her presentation by presenting the board with the following recommendations:

1. Adopt an ambitious goal: By 2022, 90% of DC youth will earn a post-secondary credential and get a job by the time they reach 24 years old.
2. Identify how many young people are falling out of the education and training pipeline
3. Develop, improve, and expand programs serving youth
 - a) More tightly link secondary/post-secondary education, and integrate education, training, work-readiness and youth development. The blend of these elements and the setting should vary depending on youths' age and academic and developmental levels.
4. Develop clear engagement points for employers to work with education and training providers
5. Insist on quality improvement and performance measurement.
6. Dramatically improve the city's ability to generate and use data to track its progress in helping young people make successful transitions to adulthood.

2.) Deputy Mayor for Education (DME), The District's *Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Partnership*

Eshauna Smith and Celine Fejeran presented on the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)'s current initiative: the *Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Partnership* and discussed the possibility of aligning program efforts with the Youth Investment Council (YIC). Eshauna and Celine shed light on areas where C2C and YIC could link their efforts, thereby effectively addressing the multiple barriers young people face in achieving career readiness. C2C aims to improve youth outcomes in education and in employment by building synergies across five program areas: (1) Early Childhood, (2) K-12 Education, (3) Post-Secondary Education (4) Disconnected Youth and (5) Youth Employment. Staff also reported on the work currently underway with the Urban Institute, which consists of reviewing baseline data and developing appropriate targets to monitor progress toward achieving successful youth outcomes.

C2C Alignment with YIC: Allison asked if the board was comfortable with aligning the traditional work of the Youth Investment Council with the C2C initiative. After hearing no opposition to the formation of this strategic alliance, the C2C partnership team committed to working together with the WIC to develop a working group around youth employment that will connect both efforts.

Board Discussion Q&A

Partnerships with DHS and DYRS: Bob Brandon suggested to De'Shawn and DME staff partner with Department of Health (DHS) and Department of Youth and Rehabilitative Services (DYRS), to address

health-related issues affecting disconnected youth populations. Given that pivotal staff like school nurses are often some of the first people to be confronted with some of the personal issues youth are facing, they could offer key advice and input on how to develop effective outcome measures and strategies. Eshauna acknowledged the significance of collaborating with DHS and indicated that they are having conversations regarding these issues.

3) The Department of Employment Services (DOES), “The District’s Workforce Investment Act Youth Programming”

Mike asked Gerren Price (Associate Director for Youth Programs) and Tanya Sapp, (General Counsel for DOES), to report on the status of the nine WIA-funded youth contracts which were reviewed by the Contract Appeals Board (CAB).

Tanya begin by describing the status of the appeals on the two in-school youth contracts. The CAB ruled that the District’s Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP) failed to follow proper procedures and failed to comply with minimum contract requirements when awarding the SDA-2 in-school youth contract. The SDA2 contract will be canceled by June 17, 2012. The SDA-1 contract is still under consideration by the CAB.

The out-of-school youth contracts comprise the remaining seven WIA youth contracts – all of which have base year expiration dates in August. The District has the right to exercise up to four option years. While these contracts were not contested before the CAB, the same process that was used for the in-school contracts was used for the out-of-school contracts. Given the CAB’s determination on the in-school youth contract processes, Gerren asked the board to consider the following options:

- 1) Renew Out-of-School Youth contracts and re-bid later (after August 2012)?
- 2) Re-bid Out-of-School Youth contracts now (prior to August 2012)?

Pros/Cons for Renewing

Pros:

- No break in service and continuity of services for youth currently enrolled
- More time to gather feedback on and design appropriate RFP and performance metric for future years
- Allows additional vendors to have time to consider participation
- Would not require significant investment of staff time

Cons

- Performance outcomes may not be met for PY11 by all current providers
- Credibility of DOES/WIC could be impacted if there is a perception that no action was taken to cure contracting and performance issues

Pros/Cons for Rebidding

Pros:

- The WIC and DOES could proactively address any concerns with program quality and performance outcomes
- Opportunity to redesign and/or realign services requested under new RFP could result in more youth being served, depending on service design chose.
- Sets the stage for DOES to seek alternative contract/grant process

Cons:

- Limited time to gather feedback on appropriate RFP design and develop a new RFP (RFP would need to be released by June 2012)
- Would require significant WIC and DOES staff time to develop RFP and review responses
- DOES grant making processes not yet finalized

The Chair asked those board members who had a conflict of interest with the *Out-of-School Youth and In-School Youth* contracts, to recuse themselves from the conversation.

Board Discussion and Q&A

Re-bid or Renew? The board's discussion centered on weighing the costs and benefits associated with the options presented by Gerren. Lyles contended that if the WIC votes to renew the contracts, the board would lose credibility in the public eye. Lisa recommended that the WIC re-bid the contracts. Allison expressed her concern that re-bidding the contracts would impact the capacity of WIC staff to complete other projects, thereby delaying the current timeline in place for the One-Stop benchmarking plan.

Re-bidding Impact on the WIC: The board asked Deputy Mayor Victor Hoskins if he could find additional resources to facilitate the re-bidding process and potential impact on WIC staff resources. He agreed to find a way to alleviate the workload of WIC staff that would result from re-bidding the contracts.

Motion: Upon a MOTION made by Jos William seconded by board member Catherine Meloy simultaneously along with the other board members, the Motion to Re-bid the Out-of-School Youth Contracts was approved and adopted.

Because of the aforementioned conflict of interest, some board members recused themselves from voting on the motion.

V. Public Comments

Martha Ross suggested that the WIC should consider focusing on capacity building and develop non-profit organizational standards.

VI. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:20 AM. The next quarterly WIC board meeting will be July 10, 2012.