



**Governor's Ohio Workforce Policy Board Meeting
WIA Compliance Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes – April 29, 2009**

Committee Members Present: Co-Chair Terry Marovich, Co-Chair Bruce Wyngaard, Al Longstreth

Additional Attendees: Mekelle Armstrong, Vangie Collazo, Michael Evans, Keith Ewald, Bob Haas, Sherry Keys-Hebron, Julia Hinten, Lisa Patt-McDaniel, Emily Scardena, John Quatman, John Weber

Welcome & Committee Member Introductions

Co- Chair Marovich called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. and welcomed those present. The committee members and guests introduced themselves. Co-Chair Marovich briefly went over the meeting agenda, the meeting materials and an overview of the committee focus.

Approval of the Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes. Corrections were noted and changed. Al Longstreth made a motion to accept the minutes and Bruce Wyngaard seconded the motion.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Discussion

John Weber of ODJFS gave a very detailed presentation regarding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and how it will affect the Ohio Workforce Investment Act programs. The common principles of ARRA and the presentation were the emphasis on direct service to job seekers, simulative affect on Ohio's economy, transparency and accountability, fostering and leveraging resources on all levels and creating good jobs very quickly. John also explained how the age eligibility for WIA ARRA funds has been increased from 21 to 24 and how none of the funds will be used for administrative costs.

John also spoke of the four statewide strategic initiatives that will utilize \$20.7 million dollars of WIA discretionary funds from the ARRA as announced by Governor Strickland. The four new initiatives, Urban Youth Works, Recovery Conservation Corps, Constructing Futures, and Ohio Learning Accounts/Project HIRE, will expand employment opportunities for urban and rural youth and traditionally underserved adults, broaden inclusion in apprenticeship programs across the state and provide an enhanced

job matching program to link employers and job seekers to training funds and tax credits in targeted regional industries.

Committee members raised concern regarding the very short timeline the funds must be spent. They were concerned that it might not be the most efficient way to create meaningful and effective programs and deliver services.

State Plan Discussion

John Weber led the discussion about the modifications to the 2009 WIA State Plan due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The committee was informed that the modifications were being completed by ODOD and ODJFS state staff and the plan would be available for public comment on Monday May 5, 2009.

Co-Chair Marovich suggested that a workgroup conference call with Brian Mannal from ODOD would be necessary to walk the WIA Compliance and Executive Committee members through the changes in the plan. Other committee members and attendees agreed that a workgroup conference call would be very valuable for interested parties. GWPAB staff is responsible for organizing the phone call and distributing the materials to WIA Compliance and Executive Committee members and state staff.

Sanctions/Incentive Policy

Mekelle Armstrong and Vangie Collazo of ODOD began the discussion explaining the details of the policy and addressing the questions posed to the committee members. The policy team explained that there are different incentive/sanctions policies for WIA funds and ARRA funds. John Weber explained that the state is required to implement a sanctions/incentives policy but has never had a policy in place. Discussions have taken place in the past but the state has not taken action to implement a policy.

Co-Chair Marovich expressed that there are indicators in the business world that determine incentives. Good companies review their workforce regularly and regroup often to make smart business decisions. Businesses determine the best way is to incentivize through examining qualifiers and indicators. Co-Chair Marovich understands that we must think of the best ways to evaluate One-Stop's because the state has to work within a structured system. Mekelle Armstrong suggested that we could look at the One-Stop performance percentages over a certain time period to determine their outcomes and in turn provide incentives.

Co-Chair Wyngaard expressed concern if a massive layoff or plant closing happens in an area the numbers of individuals served would increase. He felt that in that situation the numeric increases are irrelevant because the increase of participants is a product of the plant closing or massive layoff. Bruce asked the committee if they are seeking to incentivize such circumstances.

Al Longstreth expressed his concern regarding incentivizing innovation. He feels that innovation can be very subjective and it is very hard to measure. John Quatman expressed that if an innovative idea has a measurable and positive outcome, then the state should replicate the idea.

Co-Chair Wyngaard suggested that the state could reward the One-Stop's based on expectations established through a strategic plan. The One-Stop's would develop an excellent plan that develops strategies and defines success. Julia Hinten reminded the committee about the previous business plan developed by the One-Stop's and how the outcomes were not what the board members were expecting.

Keith Ewald of ODJFS suggested the policy should include tiers of rewards with the lowest tier as compliance.

Co-Chair Marovich recommended that the state staff should have a strategic information exchange with the folks at the local level. State staff needs to offer support and guidance to the local areas for successful implementation of strategic plans. State staff could use the very successful One-Stop's as a model.

John Weber mentioned that state staff must also be brought up to speed to successfully offer guidance and support to the local areas.

Emily Scardena of ODOD mentioned that the committee and policy team needs to look at what is currently measured to gain an understanding of how the One-Stop's can improve. As an example she explained how the current Gold Standard measures are captured. The bronze level is currently rewarded for compliance with WIA regulations and policies. The committee members then expressed that compliance with WIA is expected and exceeding performance should be rewarded.

Co-Chair Marovich suggested that the local areas should be included in the conversation regarding rewards and sanctions. She also mentioned that we must be aware that we are working with a system that has specific requirements from the Federal Department of Labor.

The committee discussed the possibility of the local areas developing a performance improvement plan. The committee inquired with John Weber if the ODJFS staff can provide the support to the local areas for strategic planning and a performance improvement plan. John explained that the state has previously implemented technical assistance performance improvement through a vendor.

The committee then addressed the possibility of creating a multi year and multi step or tiered strategic plan for performance improvement. The committee agreed that the Workforce Investment Board's must be involved with the process.

Co-Chair Wyngaard suggested that the policy staff implement one or two metrics that moves the locals in the right direction. He suggested a number of examples and options

for measurements – pass/fail standard, bell curve – top 25% performers receive incentives, evaluate performance factors – e.g. meet or exceed 7 or 9 performance factors to receive incentive.

Metrics and Accountability – Draft 4

Keith Ewald of ODJFS briefly discussed the metrics and accountability document that requested information about the workforce in the state of Ohio. Keith identified three major themes throughout the document that need to be addressed.

1. Targeted industries – identified targeted industries are very large and include roughly one third of the workforce in Ohio and over 188 occupations. For data purposes the committee needs to evaluate the targeted industries and tighten to focus from industries to occupations and training – many ways to approach this.
2. Real time data demand – data can be analyzed from electronic job boards. Keith also warned that we must be very careful with the job board analysis because many sites are not very reliable. Keith suggested that a few companies that are creditable and highly regarded. Keith mentioned that the software developer of Ohio Means Jobs (Indeed.com) could possibly build into the website a function that captures the data and program to run periodic reports. Keith voiced that this option could be very costly.
3. State Program Outcomes – state data staff can research and analyze current data that is captured by certain programs. State staff can compare data to understand if reporting is consistent. We must keep in mind that there might be difference because different programs require specific data. Keith mentioned that the software developer of Ohio Means Jobs (Indeed.com) could possibly build into the website a function that captures the data and program to run periodic reports.

The committee provided Keith with a few occupations to perform sample data analysis in a variety of ways. Keith will present at the next meeting to discuss further developments.

At 1:30 the committee meeting adjourned.