

**GOLDEN SIERRA WORKFORCE BOARD  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
SUMMARY MINUTES**

**Thursday, August 18, 2016 – 1:00 p.m.**

**Roseville Connections  
115 Ascot Dr., Ste. 180  
Roseville, CA 95661**

**I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

Quorum was established and meeting was called to order by Chair Larkey at 1:04 p.m.

Present: Rick Larkey (Chair), Michael Zimmerman (Vice-Chair), Laurel Brent-Bumb, Alexis Zoss, Carol Pepper-Kittredge\*

Absent: Martha Escobedo

Guests: Jason Buckingham, Lorna Magnussen, Jennifer Kandi

*\*Denotes late arrival or early departure*

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion** to approve the agenda by Brent-Bumb, second by Zimmerman.

**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.

Magnussen requested that item C be pulled from the consent agenda and carried over to the next meeting.

A. Approval of Minutes from May 19, 2016 EC meeting

B. Approval of Minutes from June 16, 2016 EC meeting

C. Review Minutes from July 15, 2016 WB meeting [removed]

**Motion** to approve the Consent Agenda as amended; items A & B, by Zimmerman, second by Brent-Bumb.

**Motion** approved unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – FOR THOSE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

V. APPROVE REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) FOR ONE-STOP OPERATOR

\* 1:09 Carol Pepper-Kittredge arrived

Buckingham suggested that the board contract out the services for one-stop operator. The person taking on this role would be able to work as a facilitator to bring all the partners together to discuss systems alignment in the GS region. He stated that depending on the costs, he would recommend quarterly meetings with the facilitator based on whatever goals the board establishes at the upcoming retreat, and assign work to the partners in between the quarterly meetings.

Buckingham recommended that a Request for Information (RFI) be released with guidelines as to what the board is looking for. The RFI would be out for 21 days in various publications across the local area, as well as the Golden Sierra Job Training Agency website. At this point, the budget for this role is \$15,000 a year for 2 years. This amount can be adjusted based on the RFI responses.

**Motion** to approve RFI by Zimmerman, second by Pepper-Kittredge.

**Motion** approved unanimously.

VI. WB STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION DISCUSSION

Buckingham identified Bob Lanter from the California Workforce Association as the facilitator for the retreat. The EC discussed the draft agenda for the retreat. Larkey stated that he wanted to focus on the partnership relationships during the retreat and to strengthen and build on what exists. Then, the WB can get together and make some decisions on what the next steps will be as to how they provide services to the individual employers or participants. Buckingham stated that the purpose of the agenda is to have the board focus on the system building piece within sectors where the greatest impact can occur. He added that the board should only take the lead on initiatives where the board has strategic advantage locally, and support partners who lead their own initiatives such as healthcare. Larkey stated that the morning session would be focused on what the target will be and the afternoon session will be focused on what the WB can accomplish in the next 12 months.

Pepper-Kittredge brought up money coming into the community colleges and how the board could leverage that to their advantage.

Magnussen stated that Larkey would need to augment the time schedule for the WB Retreat by about 15 minutes to allow for board business. Those items of business will be taken care of at the front end of the agenda.

The EC discussed how the board should align their plans with the plans of their partners so that they are moving towards the same goal and building partnerships.

Pepper-Kittredge suggested that the EC meets with Sierra College administration; Larkey added that eventually we should include Folsom Lake and Lake Tahoe in the discussion. Larkey suggested that the Workforce Board start with Sierra and that he and Buckingham would sit down with William Duncan and the consultant for Sierra Joint CCD.

Larkey stated that the CRANE consortium, a part of the Career Pathway Trust (CPT) effort, is another group to contact to align interests. Specifically, Larkey noted that the GSWB should focus on the El Dorado and Placer County secondary portion of the CRANE effort. The AB86 consortium comprised of the community colleges and adult education is another regional collaborative effort to consider involving in the coordination effort.

Pepper-Kittredge stated that the board has an opportunity to leverage what Sierra College strategically plans to offer in terms of courses and training. She stated that it will also benefit the people Sierra College serves. Pepper-Kittredge asked the board for permission to suggest that the consultant for Sierra Joint CCD reach out to Golden Sierra. Buckingham said absolutely because the plans should align.

## VII. REVISIT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ROLES

Buckingham stated that the role of the EC over the last few years has largely been focused on WIA budget. Staff have only asked the EC to take actions on items when there is an emergency situation or deadline. He stated that moving forward it would be beneficial for the EC to review the Title I budget as that is a requirement of WIOA, however, ensuring that the full board focuses on systems building of all titles in WIOA

Buckingham suggested to Larkey that if he could figure out how to measure the effectiveness of all the partners working together that would be a huge accomplishment.

Larkey stated that his preference is that a lot of the work be done in task groups that are brought to the larger group so that the whole is not trying to solve all of the issues that the WB might raise. He share's Jason's perspective that we avoid forming groups that meet indefinitely without defined objectives.

Larkey stated that the goal of the retreat is to define clear achievable deliverables that can be assigned to staff or task teams.

Buckingham stated that the role of the EC should be to assess how the system is working together and to make sure that happens, especially when it comes to data driven improvement to the system.

Larkey stated that he wants the EC to create the agendas together for the full board meetings. He added that they need to determine how much of that is information sharing versus discussion/deliberation.

The EC discussed pulling the GB and WB together to have a joint meeting to go over the Title I money and JPA. There was a discussion that perhaps it would be more beneficial to have the EC and GB meet in order to allow the EC to have a more intimate conversation about what it is the EC is trying to do. It was also suggested that the WB and GB meet at least once annually since hearing each other's meetings add value to both entities. The EC discussed when this meeting would take place. In the past, the meeting between the WB and GB would take place during the normal meeting time of the GB.

Larkey suggested that the EC gets their plan in shape and pull the two boards together and have some kind of presentation about what the EC is trying to do.

Buckingham suggested going to the GB after the retreat and prior to meeting with the different board of supervisors to help the process along.

VIII. WIOA TITLE IB PROPOSED LWDA PERFORMANCE GOAL NEGOTIATIONS FOR PY 2016 AND PY 2017 EDD DIRECTIVE WSDD-149

State published Draft Directive WSDD-149 which provides guidance on the process and expectations surrounding performance goals negotiation.

Here are the concerns:

Title I expected there to be direction on the negotiation of Local Performance Measures after a baseline period. Instead, the state is rolling out the negotiation early (completed by Sept 30 – long before local/regional plans are due) but will not hold areas accountable for the goals they negotiate. Additionally, they are not doing local negotiation but instead regional negotiations with the 14 Regional Planning Units (RPU). The RPUs are then expected to negotiate internally to determine measures for each of the local systems. Further concerns are that the regulations do require regions to determine additional measures of performance. However, the state is interpreting this as calling for regional negotiations of WIOA measures. Regional measure should be indicators that allow for continuous improvement of the partners regional initiatives called out in the regional plan. Not simply a regional measurement of the WIOA measures.

Buckingham will represent the RPU as the point of contact on this.

IX. REGIONAL & LOCAL PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR PY 2017-2010 EDD DIRECTIVE WSDD-146

State published Draft Directive WSDD-146 which provides some guidance on local and regional planning.

The Region will be convening folks from the local executive committees to talk about regional planning. Staff will be putting recommendations/strategies together for that meeting. Likely that we will move forward with some form of local planning that gets consolidated into a regional plan.

X. WIOA MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING REVISED EDD DIRECTIVE WSD15-12

Phase 2 – Cost Sharing Agreements moved up 6 months. No direction from state currently. Should be out in the next 30 days.

- Page 5 – MOU Phase II due date is now June 30, 2017 instead of December 31, 2017
- Page 6 – MOU Phase II due date is now June 30, 2017 instead of December 31, 2017
- Page 9 – MOU Phase II due date is now June 30, 2017 instead of December 31, 2017
- Attachment 1, page 3 - MOU Phase II due date is now June 30, 2017 instead of December 31, 2017

XI. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

Discussion combined with item XIII.

XII. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT OUT FOR WB

Report out WSDD-149, WSDD 146, and WSD 15-12.

XIII. DEVELOP WB AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

Discussion combined with item VI.

Discussion of the board's intent to bring back the combined meetings between the WB and GB.

Discussion on the mission in regards to what is the purpose or what do they want to get out of the retreat. Buckingham stated that Bob Lanter intends to take the WB through some steps that will lead them to actions that will help them meet their mission. Pepper-Kittredge felt the agenda should say that. Larkey stated that he and Buckingham will be talking to Bob Lanter on Monday based on the response from today's EC meeting. He stated that they would advise it.

Discussion of vision with some exercises surrounding that as well.

Lunch to be cut down to 30 minutes.

Brent-Bumb suggested keeping the agenda as is with lunch being 1 hour since some discussions may take longer and the WB can choose to work through lunch as time allows. She suggested to the EC that they use the existing agenda as a guideline as to how they want to operate. Larkey stated that they would get the lunch down to 30 minutes.

Add consent agenda and other points for approval at the WB retreat meeting. This will be done on the front end of the meeting.

Provider reports submitted in writing and placed on the table at the retreat. Any comments that members may have about the reports can be made at the next WB meeting.

XIV. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEW BUSINESS

XV. NEXT MEETING

September 15, 2016 – 9:00 a.m., TBD

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by Chair Larkey at 2:31 pm.

**Motion** to adjourn by Zimmerman, second by Zoss.

**Motion** approved unanimously.