

# ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

## MOU / IFA DISCUSSION

Date: April 22, 2026

Time: 2:00 PM (Called to Order at 2:01 PM)

Location: Arizona Department of Economic Services - Bob Drive, Prescott Valley; Remote

### Attendance

Committee Members: Alicia Botkin (Chair), Linda Bolyard, Chris Kawabata, Dawnette Polland

Other Attendees: Tara Matusik, Sharal Patinathan, Dr. Marylou Marcado, Marty Brennen (J.D.), Justin Teclaw, Jennifer Kelly, Jeremy Smith, John Soto, Chevera Trillo, Edwardo Soto

*Quorum*: All in attendance; quorum met

### Agenda Item

Discussion and Negotiation of the MOU/IFA Revision for Program Year 2026

### Discussion Summary

#### 1. Title I-B and Title II

- Title I-B indicated agreement with the MOU/IFA as written and remained open to revisions.
- Title II indicated agreement with the MOU/IFA as written and remained open to revisions.

MOU Reference:

General Partner Participation Requirements (Multiple Sections)

#### 2. Comprehensive One-Stop Access, Locations, and Affiliate Sites

- One-Stop locations identified: Yavapai College Prescott, Verde Valley (DES Cottonwood), and DES Prescott Valley.
- Title III requested improved representation at DES Prescott Valley and Cottonwood locations.
- Title III identified staffing limitations and indicated virtual staffing as a potential solution.
- Title IV raised multiple concerns related to representation, co-location, comprehensive One-Stop designation, and staffing expectations.
- Title IV concerns originated from multiple program areas and levels of participation.
- Virtual participants submitted concerns through documentation.
- Questions raised regarding whether all services must be physically present at each location.

# ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

## MOU / IFA DISCUSSION

- Requirement for direct linkage across all One-Stop locations discussed.
- Definition of co-location identified as unclear, specifically lacking operational detail.
- Comprehensive One-Stop expectations discussed, including requirement for full access to services.
- Affiliate site expectations discussed, including service delivery and customer satisfaction.
- DES sites noted as not having full partner presence due to staffing limitations.
- Clarification requested regarding physical vs virtual service delivery expectations.
- Discussion included need to define whether comprehensive service delivery is physical, virtual, or hybrid.
- Direct linkage mechanisms noted as already in place.
- Priority identified for increasing physical presence where feasible.
- Physical presence not required for comprehensive status, but services must include full access and warm handoffs.

MOU Reference:

“Comprehensive One-Stop Access and Presence” (Page 6)

“Affiliate Sites” (Page 14)

“Compliance Note” (Page 17)

### 3. Vision and Goals

- Title IV indicated disagreement with the comprehensive One-Stop model and additional staffing expectations at affiliate sites.
- Clarification requested regarding Workforce Development Board goals and alignment.
- Questions raised regarding committees and workgroups and their identification.
- Noted that no Executive Committee currently exists.
- Noted that the Board previously decided not to establish an Executive Committee.
- Questions raised regarding workgroup structure within the Workforce Development Plan.
- Discussion regarding strong regional economies and whether a regional strategy is currently being developed.
- Questions raised regarding amendment and modification processes within the MOU/IFA and whether requirements are defined.
- Language noted as being pulled from prior MOU/IFA documents and requiring partner verification and clarification.
- Questions raised regarding impact on partner obligations if a partner withdraws.

# ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

## MOU / IFA DISCUSSION

- Duration of MOU and amendment requirements discussed.

MOU Reference:

“Vision and Goals” (Page 1)

#### 4. Governance, Roles, Committees, and Authority

- Governance structure to be upheld by LWDB; distinction made between governance and program operations.
- Questions raised regarding committee structure and existence of workgroups.
- Bylaws committee noted as existing.
- Discussion regarding potential need for a financial committee.
- Clarification requested regarding One-Stop Committee chair selection and agenda responsibility.
- Discussion regarding community participation in committee membership.
- Questions raised regarding responsibility for meeting minutes and whether rotation among partners is required.
- Suggestion made to establish internal process for managing minutes.
- Title IV agreed to take minutes at the next meeting.

MOU Reference:

“One-Stop Operator Scope of Authority” (Page 5)

“OSC Coordination” (Page 6)

“LWDB Authority” (Page 12)

#### 5. Agenda Structure, Meetings, and Open Meeting Law

- Clarification requested regarding when meetings and agendas are agreed upon and submitted.
- Discussion regarding requirement for agenda submission three days prior.
- Need for descriptive details and clear communication in agenda items identified.
- Collaborative process via email and meetings discussed.
- Flexible scheduling and adjustments discussed.
- Clarification requested regarding Open Meeting Law applicability to specific meetings.
- Clarification requested regarding required submission timelines (3 days vs 5 days vs 10 days).
- Discussion regarding quarterly meeting structure and scheduling.
- Draft meeting timelines discussed.
- Concerns raised regarding insufficient detail in agendas.
- Need identified for improved agenda clarity and focus.
- Discussion regarding collaborative control of agenda content.
- Discussion regarding materials being provided to the Board in advance.

# ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

## MOU / IFA DISCUSSION

- Discussion regarding whether the Chair should provide meetings; agreement indicated.

MOU Reference:

“OSC Agenda Development and Participation” (Page 7)

“OSC Meeting Scheduling and Notice” (Page 8)

### 6. Performance, Data, and Reporting

- Clarification requested regarding sharing performance data prior to reporting.
- Need for verification of processes across Arizona@Work identified.
- Questions raised regarding reporting structures and expectations.

MOU Reference:

Performance Reporting and Data Sharing Requirements (General Sections)

### 7. Service Delivery, Case Management, and Business Services

- Clarification requested regarding orientation processes at each center.
- Questions raised regarding responsibility for job seeker guidance and service delivery within Arizona@Work.
- Business services coordination discussed; clarification requested whether responsibility lies with OSC or OSO.
- Discussion regarding co-enrollment and seamless service delivery across partners.
- A@W identified as providing modalities to support service delivery across partners.
- Discussion regarding individualized career services and case management responsibilities.
- Clarification requested whether services are delivered by title programs or centralized roles.
- Need identified to clearly define responsibilities across titles.

MOU Reference:

“Description of Services” (Page 4)

“Case Management and Career Services” (Page 13)

### 8. Co-Location, Coverage, and Operational Structure

- Definition of co-location identified as lacking operational requirements.
- Discussion regarding phone and front desk coverage expectations.
- Coverage may be overseen by OSO.
- Questions raised regarding cost-sharing breakdown for staffing and coverage.
- Title IV indicated willingness to participate in cost sharing for front desk operations.

# ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

## MOU / IFA DISCUSSION

- Potential to bring cost-sharing models back to committee for further discussion.
- Definitions including direct linkage identified as needing updates.

MOU Reference:

“Co-Location and Infrastructure Requirements” (Page 16)

### 9. Infrastructure Funding Agreement (IFA), Cost Allocation, and In-Kind Contributions

- Cost allocation based on benefit received discussed.
- In-kind contributions discussed, including need for defined dollar amounts.
- Requirement identified for specific dollar values for approval.
- Questions raised regarding campus usage (Prescott Valley and Verde Valley).
- Shared office space at DES discussed.
- Cottonwood not required for Title I or Title II participation.
- Clarification requested regarding Title II-specific obligations.
- Questions raised regarding whether space contributions qualify as in-kind.

MOU Reference:

“Infrastructure Funding Agreement / Cost Allocation” (Page 21)

### 10. Referral Process and Customer Access

- Need identified for clear referral process.
- Recommendation to include privacy requirements in referral documentation.
- Suggestion to include accessible referral links.
- Direct linkage required for service access across all partners.

MOU Reference:

Referral and Access Requirements (Page 21)

### 11. Customer Service, Surveys, and Performance Measures

- Definition of customer service discussed.
- Rating of 8 and above identified as “excellent.”
- Questions raised regarding survey distribution.
- Need identified to develop surveys.
- Agreement to create two surveys: job seekers and employers.
- Recommendation to involve IR and include community representation.
- Plan to bring IR into future discussion.

MOU Reference:

Customer Service and Performance Standards (Page 17)

### 12. Monitoring, Signatures, and Document Accuracy

- Monitoring references not signed by DES cannot be used.
- Corrections required for names and interim designations.

# **ONE STOP COMMITTEE – SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES**

## **MOU / IFA DISCUSSION**

- Signature pages require updates.
- IFA dates must be updated to reflect superseding agreement.

MOU Reference:

“Monitoring and Signatures” (Pages 25–29)

### 13. Final Document Revisions and Cleanup

- Pages 38–40 require updates to names and content.
- Pages 47 and 52 require removal of outdated program references (TANF/jobs).
- Page 51 requires LMI clarification.
- Document revisions to be submitted for feedback.

MOU Reference:

“Document Exhibits and Supporting Sections” (Pages 38–52)

### 14. Additional Discussion Items and Operational Notes

- Program coordinator position noted as posted.
- Monthly OSC meetings discussed.
- Quarterly reporting structure discussed (two per quarter).
- Clarification requested regarding MOU submission timeline to the State.
- Scheduling flexibility discussed.

MOU Reference:

General Governance and Administrative Sections

### **Topic for Next Meeting**

MOU/IFA

Discussion will continue and be placed on the agenda for the May 5, 2026 meeting.

### **Public Comment**

No public comments were made.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:16 PM