



Maricopa County Workforce Development Board – Quality Workforce Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Rummel Construction, Inc.
22655 N. Miller Road F100, Scottsdale 85255
WebEx: <https://mcwdb-1095-9b71.my.webex.com/meet/mcwdb>
Phone: +1-510-338-9438; Access Code/Meeting ID: 625 125 871

Members Present: Vanessa Andersen, Mark Wagner, Shawn Hutchinson (Ph.), Tina Luke, Ashley Wilhelm
Members Absent: Steve Yamamori

Call to Order

Quality Workforce Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Andersen called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

Roll Call – Board Liaison, Nancy Avina, took roll; a quorum of the workgroup was present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Workgroup lead, Ms. Andersen, asked for a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. Tina Luke made a motion to approve, Ashley Wilhelm seconded the motion. All present were in favor; motion carried.

Targeted Occupations & Related Research

Management Analyst, Isabel Creasman, reviewed the purpose for the meeting and the topics that would be covered. Terry Farrel, Program Manager – Adult & Dislocated Worker Program, provided an overview of how workforce and training services are currently provided in the Maricopa County workforce development area and the funding of OST and apprenticeships via individual training accounts. David Bergeson, WIOA Program Supervisor, provided information on the current training services delivery model as it relates to OST's, which is Informed Customer Choice. The benefits and the disadvantages of the current model were shared. Mr. Bergeson then reviewed the Pima County service delivery model and reviewed the pros and cons of this model. The final model reviewed by Mr. Bergeson was the WorkAdvance model. A key difference with this model is that while it is a training and employment program model, it is not based on WIOA funding restrictions. After reviewing the benefits and challenges with the WorkAdvance program, Mr. Bergeson provided some recommendations for adopting a training model in the workforce area. The recommendation was to adopt a blended model, which includes selection of occupations for training based on wages, employer needs and job seeker needs; and providing a more standardized process for participant assessment.

Approval of Selection Criteria for Target Occupations

Management Analyst, Isabel Creasman, provided an overview on the topic of selecting Target Occupations. Target occupations are a subset of the 129 in-demand occupations selected by the board in April, 2019, selected for occupational skills training funding and apprenticeship funding. The proposed selection criteria was presented to the Workgroup. Data used to make a recommendation included the 2018-2023 Occupational growth projections, 2018 Occupational Employment & Wage estimates, the MIT Living Wage Calculator, and Historical training outcomes data. The criteria included selecting occupations with an educational attainment of a Bachelor's degree or below. Dr. Creasman noted that setting a threshold of Associate's degree or lower led to a decrease in the number and variety of target occupations. The living wages threshold was set at \$11.90 or higher as this is the living wage calculated for a single adult with no dependents. Growth rate was set at 9.1% or higher (this is the median projected, 2018-2023, job growth rate for the County). Projected annual openings was set at 75 projected annual openings or higher (this is the median for projected annual openings). The final criteria proposed was overriding labor market conditions, local knowledge/wisdom provided by the service provider or employers/board members. Resulting target occupations list was reviewed and included 83 target occupations. Dr. Creasman noted that the list is not static, it will be reviewed each May. In addition, the list also be revised throughout the year via a formal board approval process. Discussion was held on the selection criteria, thoughts

were shared on whether the wages were too low and the growth rate being too high. Ms. Andersen asked for a motion to approve the proposed selection criteria. Tina Luke made a motion. Mark Wagner seconded the motion. Shawn Hutchinson expressed concerns on the low wages threshold. Discussion held. Decision was postponed. Dr. Creasman will provide another option for the selection criteria for target occupations using the 2018 median wages for the County (\$18.27) as a threshold. The two options will be revisited at the next meeting.

Selection of ITA Funded Occupations

The next topic reviewed was whether funding for OSTs and apprenticeships should be limited to just target occupations or target occupations and three additional non-target occupations. The benefits and disadvantages were reviewed with the Workgroup (refer to meeting materials). The recommendation was to go with the option to limit this training funding to just the target occupations. Discussion was held. Ms. Anderson asked for a motion to recommend limiting OST and apprenticeship funding to target occupations only. Tina Luke made a motion, Mark Wagner seconded the motion. No additional discussion was held. All were in favor; motion approved.

Selection of ITA Limits

Dr. Creasman provided an overview of the current ITA limits. Adult: \$3,000 (non-target sectors), \$4,000 (target sectors); DW \$4,000; Youth \$8,000. These limits were selected using a regionalized approach- City of Phoenix has the same limits for adult/DW and a \$9000 limit for youth (\$3,000 per year). The proposal for future state is to have a consistent approach for setting ITA limits across all programs as the costs of training do not vary based on the program type. In addition, there would be an option for a participant to obtain a second ITA if the participant successfully completed one ITA funded course and the request is for a program along a career pathway; or, if the second ITA provides training in a field where the participant can use transferable skills. Two options were presented: the first option is a flat rate approach for all training and all programs with a maximum of \$7,000. Option two was a tiered model (up to \$3,000, \$5,000, or \$7,000) for training funding based on the training cost for the occupation. Methodology, pros, and cons were shared with the Workgroup. Discussion was held. Ms. Andersen engaged committee members for their thoughts and recommendation. Ms. Andersen asked for a motion to recommend the tiered approach. Tina Luke made a motion, Mark Wagner seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Selection of Assessments

Patrick Learned, Program Supervisor, provided an overview and review of assessments: how they are used, criteria for selecting a valid assessment, and a definition. Mr. Learned then provided the Workgroup with an overview of the assessments that are currently being utilized in the delivery of adult and youth services. Assessments include: an intake assessment, needs assessment, basic skills assessments, interests measures, skills assessments, personality inventory, and a values assessment. Mr. Learned reviewed what each assessment was meant to measure and how assessments were used. Mr. Learned then provided an overview of the process used to determine a proposed future state. He shared a handout of the research which included a description of each assessment, whether it was valid, if the assessment had a manual, the time it took to administer the assessment, the skills each assessment measured, and the cost. Based on his research a set of assessments was recommended to be used in the area. Recommendations included: (a) intake process will remain the same, (b) needs assessment- keep the BESI, (c) basic needs assessment- youth-OPAC or Rio Salado to provide TABE, (d) interest measures- My Next Move, (e) skills assessments- OPAC, (f) personality inventory - Carl Jung Briggs Myers, (g) values assessment- replace AZCIS with Career Scope, and (h) career readiness- ACRC. Discussion and clarification was held. Workgroup discussed whether there were too many assessments and whether all these assessments were necessary. It was suggested that the assessments are reviewed with the employers to see clarification on whether employers find use in these assessments. Request was made for additional information i.e., utilization data, success behind assessments, is there a true benefit?, does this get participants employed?, matrix of what employers need. Extensive Discussion held. Topic will be revisited at another meeting.

Selection of Support Services

Jeannie Reardon, Program Supervisor, Mark Hernandez, Vocational Rehabilitation Assistant Program Manager, and Elaine Farinas Lopez, WIOA Program Supervisor, reviewed the Supportive Services topic with the Workgroup. The presenters provided an overview of the current supportive services policy, including currently approved services and limits. The key questions for the Workgroup included- what services should be provided to participants? What level of funding should be provided? Whether we have the necessary mechanisms to deliver these services. The proposed options for possible changes to services were discussed and included: increasing the recommended limits, adding incentives, or increasing recommended limits & adding incentives. The pros and cons of keeping supportive services as is, or amending them with one of the other options were reviewed with the group. In addition, the research findings from other local areas were also shared with the Workgroup. The group recommended increasing the funding, adding incentives, and contracting out supportive services out. The Workgroup discussed various aspects of the proposal and asked for additional information regarding: What is the budget for support services now? vs. with the proposed changes? They would like to see data to support increase. In addition, Youth Committee Chair, Elizabeth Cole would like the opportunity to share information on youth supportive services proposal with the Committee. Additional information requested: Cost of outsourcing and what would that look like. Also, Workgroup would like to learn more about incentives, what would be a good funding amount be? At what milestones? They would also like more information on the effectiveness of incentives. Topic will be revisited at another meeting.

Action Items/Next Steps

There are three items that will have to be revisited by the Workgroup at a later date:

1. Target occupations selection criteria
2. Assessments selection for the local workforce area
3. Supportive Services for the local workforce area

Call to the Public

Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Andersen, called for public comment. No public comment.

Adjourn

Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Anderson, adjourned meeting at 12:44 pm.

**For additional information, contact MCWDB Staff, at: mcwdb@maricopa.gov*