

GOLDEN SIERRA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RETREAT AGENDAMINUTES

Thursday, November 13, 2014 – 1 pm

Roseville Connections
115 Ascot Drive, Suite 180 (Room A)
Roseville, CA 95661

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Quorum was established and the meeting was called to order by Miller at 1:00 pm

Present: Tink Miller, Rick Larkey, Kevin Ferreira, Martha Escobedo

Absent: Laurel Brent-Bumb

Guests: Jason Buckingham, Lorna Magnussen, Darlene Galipo, Terrie Trombley,
Traci Cummings, Michael Indiveri

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve agenda by Ferreira, second by Escobedo

Motion approved unanimously

III. CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and will be approved by one blanket motion.

For Approval

A. Approval of Minutes from August 21, 2014 EC meeting

For Information

B. Review of Minutes from September 18, 2014 WIB meeting

C. Attendance Log

Motion to approve consent agenda items A – C by Larkey, second by Escobedo.

Motion approved unanimously

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – FOR THOSE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Miller stated her agency has been working on the Net Neutrality issue with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). In the past year, the FCC has been considering regulating internet traffic and internet providers. The battle is between the public and the Chair of the FCC.

In the past, the Chair has put forward plans that have been rejected. He will be submitting another plan that allows different providers to have more access to the internet and the ability to control their customer's internet speed and restrictions. Over 4 million people have submitted comments to the FCC against this concept and feel the internet is an integral part of their lives, should be classified similar to public utilities, and internet providers should not be able to choose which customers will have restrictions and higher internet speeds. Broadband is an issue for rural areas and many rural communities do not have access to broadband. SEDCorp and Sierra Business Council have been working as a part of a broadband coalition that has made progress with providers. ATT and Verizon providers have built infrastructures in rural areas and now there is an ATT tower on the Foresthill divide. Miller stated individuals can access a website, www.freepress.net, and read detailed background information regarding this issue, and call and/or email the White House and/or FCC.

Larkey stated Harvard University produced a study about cities that have taken the initiative to build their own networks to increase performance and reduce costs. Miller added that one of the FCC plans would prohibit local communities from building their own networks, and we don't want that.

V. NAWB CONFERENCE

Buckingham stated that Golden Sierra, in the past, has sent 4 representatives (3 Executive Committee members and 1 Governing Body) to the annual NAWB Conference. This year's conference in Washington DC is scheduled for March 28 – 31, 2015. Golden Sierra has budgeted for the NAWB Conference, but will need approval from the Governing Body due to out of state travel.

Buckingham stated that because this is a transition year and the new WIOA regulations will be provided by the end of January, it is important that we have representation at the NAWB Conference. Buckingham stated the Executive Committee could recommend sending 5 representatives plus Buckingham to attend the NAWB Conference. The group concurred that this would be beneficial to offer to full Executive Committee (5) and Buckingham.

Recommendation to the Governing Body to approve funding for out of state travel for 7 attendees [5 Executive; 1 Director; 1 GB] to NAWB Conference, and designate a Governing Body member to attend if interested.

Larkey inquired if this board ever sent anyone to Cap to Cap. Buckingham stated that we do not as this is framed as a lobbying effort which is prohibited by WIA; however, Buckingham and Miller said that various board members have attended in other capacities including Supervisor Norma Santiago. Buckingham added that we have been involved in the development of various white papers that apply to workforce.

VI HIGH PERFORMANCE BOARD (HPB) UPDATE

Buckingham reemphasized applying for the HPB status. According to WIOA, the Governor's discretionary funding will increase, and Golden Sierra will need the HPB designation to receive additional points towards RFPs that the Governor will release.

Buckingham stated that at the Readiness Conference there was a comment made that some of the language in the code may be suspended. The state board has asked Golden Sierra to apply for the HPB, because we are only four points away from receiving it. If the HPB status doesn't get suspended for implementation, Golden Sierra will be positioned to receive discretionary funding.

Buckingham referred to the Reviewer's Rubric handout and stated the rubric is what the evaluators use to review the state plans. While Golden Sierra didn't apply for the HPB status, we were reviewed anyway during the plan review process. The second handout is the rater's comments and scores from that review. Buckingham stated that Golden Sierra scored very well, and was only four points away from receiving the HPB designation.

Buckingham stated that he and Indiveri came up with additional information for the High Performance Local Board Certification, and sent an email October 31, 2014, to Doug Sale at the State Board as requested. The primary comments answered in the email were in regards to clarity on metrics and how we measure things. Buckingham stated that Mr. Sale will start reviewing our submission sometime after November 14, 2014.

Miller inquired if Mr. Sale would be reviewing our submission individually or with a team. Buckingham stated that he was unsure of that, but felt that based on his conversation with Mr. Sale he alone would be reviewing the submission.

Indiveri stated that at the initial plan submission workshop that teams made up of EDD and partner staff would be reviewing the plan coordinated by the State Board; they could possibly go back to those groups.

Indiveri stated that the clarity on the metrics were questions such as, what you want to do and how do you determine if you succeeded. They want numbers, metrics, performance, scores to get all the points on rubric. This includes partner roles and performance.

Miller said that her recollection was that we did not apply for HPB status due to the membership mandate. Buckingham stated that was correct; however, we received a passing score in this area.

Buckingham stated that Indiveri's comments were correct regarding the need for measurement, but some of the questions were confusing. Such as, explain how you are going to impact the dropout rate; however, the majority of our money is supposed to go to out of school youth. What efforts are we supposed to take at the board level that don't require WIA money to impact the dropout rate is what they are asking you to do; such things as, are you coordinating with education outside of the WIA system and how do you quantify that.

Buckingham said that while we have our standard measurements, entered employment, retention, etc., as we move towards planning for WIOA we need to look at expenditures. Where are we spending our money....Are we emphasizing work based training in apprenticeships or OJTs, and, if so, how are we quantifying it. Indiveri added the need to include how you are soliciting other funding (partner, employer or foundation) to accomplish these goals, and how do you report that back to everyone in the system. They assume that the local board will establish these as goals for the community because all the stakeholders are connected.

Larkey felt that there is a different issue with CAP and CRANE, and what he learned at the WIOA Orientation about the expectations, roles of the WIB and regional activity. Larkey stated he thinks we need to spend time with everybody figuring out how we will fulfill the deliverables for these different pots of money, and what is reasonable for us to accomplish. Larkey stated that community colleges should be involved as well as CAP and CRANE. Larkey continued that if our money is focused on out of school youth, then he can see Golden Sierra getting involved with independent study, and facilitating student's transition into programs or develop alternatives for marginal students. While we clearly have a role in this, it is difficult due to the funding restriction. Buckingham agreed that we need to clearly identify our roles.

Miller stated that Department of Rehabilitation is also concerned with the language in WIOA, and serving all the youth when looking at the numbers of the student population in the state. The Department of Rehabilitation is looking at what exists now, Transition Partnership Program (TPP) in the high schools that work with students who have Individualized Education Programs (IEP) and the Workability Program.

Buckingham asked the committee to feel free to provide him with any feedback to the packet. He also stated that if we are not granted the HPB status, we will have another opportunity to submit. We have items that we have identified measurements for that we can track as long as WIA is in existence and through the first transition period.

Miller stated that Department of Rehabilitation is a mandated partner under WIOA, and their role is much more delineated and expanded. Miller added that Department of Rehabilitation is currently taking public comment on their strategic plan.

VII. CWA WIOA ORIENTATION DISCUSSION

Escobedo stated the CWA WIOA orientation was very good, but she was overwhelmed with information.

Buckingham stated he thought it would have been nice if the state board had been in attendance to answer questions, or give their opinion about what they think the impact may be.

Larkey said the CWA conference analysis was that you have permission to do a lot of things, or continue as is. Buckingham added this gives us the maximum amount of flexibility.

Larkey stated he had questions regarding the value that will be placed on regional collaboration verses the individual WIB's, and another question was to what degree are these mandates to work together in terms of CalWORKs and disability.

Buckingham stated that Resource Sharing Agreements (RSA) have been replaced by Cost Sharing Agreements (CSA), which are essentially the same thing. RSA is negotiated locally and unless the state steps in, the CSA will produce the same results the RSA did. WIOA did build in mechanisms for the state to intervene should local negotiations on cost sharing not be productive.

Trombley felt that there still may not be any teeth in enforcing the infrastructure costs from partners; however, she had heard that possibly at the state level the core partners may be mandated by the Governor. Buckingham added that this was included in CWA's Recommendations for Implementation of WIOA; these recommendations have been submitted to the state and federally.

VIII. WIOA IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING

Buckingham asked the committee members if they had any questions, and/or specific areas that need clarification from the CWA WIOA Orientation that he can take back to the association to get clarification.

Ferreira stated he is concerned about the responsibility and requirements for the staff of the WIB, and making sure the staff understands the new rules and roles of the administrative jobs.

Buckingham felt that administratively running the agency there isn't much change, and can be easily implemented with minimal policy change; however, things like regional planning, metrics, and performance will be the board's responsibility, and is a much more significant shift.

Buckingham feels that the board should review all of its policies, procedures, and initiatives. From that review the WIB should take the best, and eliminate what we do not think is effective and move forward with something new. There is a huge opportunity here.

Miller stated she finds the state's databases very problematic, and asked if there are published standards or indicators. Buckingham stated the state system is not ideal, and there is pressure for areas that he would call "*stand alone*" to join the state system. Buckingham felt that until solutions were negotiated at the state level, he would not recommend releasing local control and moving to the state system.

Indiveri noted that the system also has a huge tie in to the performance metrics; in order to assess your accomplishments you need data to analyze. Indiveri inquired if the board had ever received partner performance data; he has not. Indiveri stated that the new Act assumes you know or have access to this data. This data, including the historical data needed to establish a base, is critical in making strategic choices of what your performance should be.

Miller asked if Indiveri was stating that there were no published standards and indicators on partner performance. Indiveri said that while stakeholders and partners have given presentations to the WIB, they didn't contain statistics to the degree that WIA requires.

Indiveri stated that this new law is requiring more coexistence, and you need to have an understanding of each partner's roles and activities. Some of the new programs include entrepreneurship, and the expansion of incumbent worker training; this could be an opportunity for the board to get feedback from partners on best practices, and models that work. Miller was pleased with the expansion of the incumbent worker training, as this had not previously been a focus.

Indiveri noted that enhanced partnership interaction such as the emphasis on career pathways is definitely in the Act; anyone going into training should be in a career pathway situation. In addition, we have the initiative in California [AB86] that is not just WIA, but includes the school system (community colleges and adult ed). Buckingham stated that career pathways is a huge conversation, and believes anyone who goes to training is in a pathway by definition. Buckingham and Larkey said that this needs to be defined. Larkey added that there also needs to be a collaborative process in identifying the needs and resources with partners and stakeholders. Buckingham concurred with the necessity for a collaborative process to avoid duplication and ensure efficiency. Miller stated that she works with national, state and local organizations, and they use LISTSERV in their process. Buckingham added that this is a great segue into increased emphasis on using technology in the Act.

Buckingham referred to the WIOA Action Matrix. He explained that he identified areas that he believes will be important, and identified who will be responsible for performing those actions.

- **Joint Powers Agreement (JPA):** A revised JPA was about to go out to County Counsel for review under WIA; however, due to WIOA passage it was put on hold. The Governing Body and Agency Counsel are working on revised language to incorporate the roles and responsibilities of the Governing Body under WIOA. This is a Governing Body responsibility.
- **Designation as a local area.** The process is outlined; if you are a local area that has successfully performed, and have been fiscally sound for two years prior to the enactment the Governor is required to designate you as a local area. However, the process for applying for designation has not been established. Buckingham suggested writing a letter to the State Board/Governor with a cc to CWA requesting designation, and have the Chair of the Governing Body and WIB sign it. CWA's recommendations is that the Governor should designate all local areas by

- **Request for approval to remain a One-Stop Center.** WIOA states we must have one One-Stop Operator in our region. Buckingham stated that if we have to procure the One-Stop, we may not be allowed to respond to the procurement. This would require Golden Sierra to transition all of the Placer County staff to unemployment, or assign them different responsibilities. This will put Golden Sierra operations, in Placer County, in a difficult situation considering each One-Stop Operator needs to be collated with EDD. Our only EDD office is in Roseville. Buckingham's recommendation is to have Golden Sierra request approval to be the One-Stop Operator; this requires approval from Chief Elected Official (Governing Body), and the Governor. Buckingham stated that these are action items for the WIB and suggest that they are on the November 20, 2014, WIB agenda for approval.

The Executive Committee gave direction to staff to prepare letters for the request for designation as a local area, and a request for approval to remain a One-Stop Operator to be presented to the WIB.

Governance Action Items-Buckingham reviewed:

- **Review of WIB Functions** – Look for gaps and opportunities. There will be 5 additional functions and we need to review which ones will be priorities.
- **Review Bylaws** – Review consistency with new responsibility and functions.
- **Review WIB/Governing Body Agreement.**
- **Review WIB Directives** – Review directives to determine if they are still appropriate.
- **Set Qualifications for Director** – Buckingham stated that the Governing Body may have input regarding WIB Director Qualifications. The qualifications for the WIB Director are to be developed at the board level. There may be specifics that come out in the regulations. Buckingham believes they are looking for specific trainings, or a certain education level a director should have.

Membership Action Items:

- **Review of the current WIB Membership, and ensure that we are compliant with WIOA.** Buckingham stated that Magnussen is working on a resource to provide to the full board of who is currently on the board, and who we need for WIOA. Buckingham added that the board also needs to consider what to do if the board isn't in compliance, or is larger than we want it to be. We need to have people on the board that are decision makers in particular sectors.

Magnussen will prepare a side-by-side comparison of current WIA board composition and requirements against WIOA, as well as identify any gaps. Magnussen stated under WIOA the member may only serve in one category; unlike WIA where a member may serve in multiple categories. The Chief Local Elected Officers (CLEO)/Governing Body will determine the composition of the board; therefore, input from the Executive Committee may help to influence the structure of the board. Buckingham suggested Golden Sierra utilize an Ad-Hoc Committee for membership recruitment; Miller concurred and said that maybe membership and bylaws could be combined and conducted by the same Ad-Hoc.

Structure Action Items:

- **Review the current committees** and ask if they are adequate for what we need. We should be doing regional collaboration; maybe we should join together with SETA for committee meetings with business engagement, and look for regional initiatives instead of local initiatives.

Buckingham stated that pathways discussion is a great example; do we want the whole board to manage it, or should we assign subject experts to manage it. Larkey expressed that this is an opportunity to work together with partners and stakeholders to satisfy all of our requirements, and feel like we are all on the same page.

Buckingham stated that performance is another great example. Bringing to Indiveri's point, Golden Sierra doesn't have people report to us in the same way the WIA Partners report to us. We need to manage that somehow. In the new structure we have a common measure across partners, and in the future we could invite additional partners to participate and create continuous engagement.

Buckingham stated that another way to manage that is to look at our programs in the future as branded initiatives instead of awarding in an area to provide training. A good example was the Summer Youth Experiences. We branded it, marketed it as a work experience program, and it was easy to manage that particular program, and look at the performance of that program. Maybe we could brand specific sectors, and track performance by expenditures and/or placement. We also know that we will have upcoming business engagement metrics.

Planning/Service Delivery Action Items:

- **Engage with our core partners.** Buckingham suggested we invite our core partners to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their concerns with implementation of WIOA. Magnussen stated all the core partners were sent out an introduction letter from Buckingham and Miller.
- **Youth Council:** Buckingham felt that there was not a need for a Youth Council with the new system. While WIOA has a requirement for community input on youth strategies, Buckingham doesn't feel it needs to take place through a Youth Council.

Buckingham believes that there is a place for Ad-Hoc youth work, but looking at our overall planning youth strategies should be considered in everything. Buckingham stated that our emphasis is going to be on out of school youth; with that in mind, everything we do should include some influence on how we impact those young adults.

The Youth Council has done good work, but they have struggled to achieve and maintain quorums. The energy of the youth council depends on the initiatives they are working on to help drive them. Buckingham stated he believes it should be done by Ad-Hoc meetings focused on particular issues instead of continuing to manage a standing regular meeting.

The group discussed forming stronger relationships with existing Youth Commissions to solicit input and use as a resource. Buckingham added that outreach efforts could be helpful, such as Larkey's previous comment regarding outreach. Designing a resource to educate them on what is out there might be a youth specific Ad-Hoc committee project.

Additional topics (Buckingham):

- Added to the previous discussion about joint committees, and stated that another thing to look at in regional planning efforts is the possibility of joint policies (training caps and incumbent worker training).
- Do RFQ's to identify vendors to provide services. Having an established vendor list would expedite providing qualified services. A great example of that is our basic computer workshops being provided in the One-Stop.
- We will need to do another RFQ/RFP for training services and this can be further discussed. We know that we are going to have to competitively procure One-Stop services whether or not Golden Sierra is approved to continue to provide One-Stop services. We need to get a list of qualified individuals that are interested in providing services. In addition to that, we may want to add training initiatives.
- Have an increased emphasis on how we use technology, and how we want to plan for that in our budget.
- Branding discussion needs to occur. Do we continue with the connections brand, or adopt whatever the government says we should have.
- Federal government has added accessibility reviews; Golden Sierra is going to need policies and procedures in place in regards to accessibility review and reporting.
- Future planning will need a lot of data; do we want to continue purchasing EMSI subscription, save that money, or procure services that will help identify gaps. Discussed regional data by collaborating with other entities. Buckingham added that his goal is to maintain capabilities, while ensuring that we are mindful of the cost.
- Assess One-Stop centers and services being provided to ensure needs are being met. Alpine is a good example: large investment to serve a small population in the One-stop; they may want to explore a previous model of youth work experience. Miller stated that she would personally support that, but would like to also see continued access to computers at HHS for online access and/or training. Buckingham added that South Lake Tahoe is also a good example. Larkey inquired if Alpine was open to change. Buckingham stated that he doesn't believe they have a desire to continue having a One-Stop in its current form; they are interested in having services that meet the needs of their community. The group discussed meeting with Nichole Williamson and Supervisor Katherine Rakow to discuss their needs further.
- Negotiate MOUs under WIOA; Galipo expressed the need to start working on these right away as negotiating the MOU can be a timely process. Galipo added that having the support of this committee in starting that conversation will demonstrate a united front, and certainly enhance the process.

Larkey thanked Buckingham for introducing the WIOA Action Matrix – Draft.

Action Plan:

- Prepare a letter requesting for local area designation and present to the WIB and GB at their next meetings.
- Prepare a letter of request to be a One-Stop Operator with the recommendations of the WIB and have it approved by the GB at the next meeting.
- Draft WID/WDB membership side-by-side
- Executive Committee convened the required partners
- Establish Vendor List (RFQ)
- MOUs would need to be renegotiated under WIOA

IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEW BUSINESS

None

X. NEXT MEETING

December 18, 2014 – Joint Executive & Finance, Roseville Connections

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Miller, second by Escobedo.

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 PM