

Governor's Council for Workforce and Economic Development
WORKFORCE SYSTEMS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting

Date: April 24, 2017
Time: 11:00 A.M.
Place: Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City

Members Present: Richard McPherson, Nathaniel Harding.

Staff: Jeane Burruss, Linda Emrich.

Guests: DeAnna Smith-OESC/SOS Team, Jared Bates-Career Tech/SOS Team.

Welcome

Co-chair Richard McPherson opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. The agenda was reviewed.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Nathaniel Harding to approve the March 3, 2017 meeting minutes. Richard McPherson seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Regional/Local Plans Discussion by System Oversight Sub-committee

Jeane Burruss, Oklahoma Office of Workforce Development (OOWD), stated that Oklahoma has an approved State Plan that explains what we are going to do every four years to meet the workforce needs. This plan is approved by the Governor's Council. At that time, we sent out guidance to the local areas and regions on how to put together a plan for the future. The plans have to be submitted to the Workforce System Oversight Committee's System Oversight Subcommittee (SOS) for review and eventually approval to send to the Governor's Council. The plans should not cover what is going on now or in the past, but what they are planning for in the future for the next four years. DeAnna Smith and Jared Bates are both on the SOS and have taken on the task of reviewing the plans that were submitted by the regions and they are going to report to us today what they have found so far.

DeAnna (DeDe) Smith explained that in the guidance issued regarding the regional plans, the plans were due to the Oversight Committee/OOWD by April 1st. By April 1, they had to have their drafts completed, posted online or somewhere for a 30-day comment period, and that kicked in their 90-day review period to actually issue their report as to recommendation to the committee for either approval or denial. For the report today, they incorporated a really quick "flash review". The SOS Team did a flash review and DeDe and Jared did a more comprehensive review of the plans. They incorporated all of the comments from the team that was involved in the flash review. After reporting on the flash review, the team will spend a full day of reviewing the plans as a group using a tool. The tool will allow them to make sure the plans are including all of the information needed such as strategies and goals, and the questions asked in the guidance are answered appropriately. There are nine plans altogether considering the regional plans along with the local plans. By May 10, all of the plans will have been reviewed and all of the comments combined into one document so that they can present them to

Jeane. There are going to be deficiencies that are going to have to be corrected and they are working that into their tentative dates. The OOWD will be sending back out to the locals the plans that have deficiencies that have been identified. They are planning on four (4) weeks to be enough time for the locals to address the deficiencies – or have them back to the SOS Team by June 9 to give DeDe and Jared enough time to review the revisions, compile everything, and by June 14 to be able to give their recommendations to the WSOC. That should be sufficient time for the WSOC to issue the notice or approval that the plans have been approved by June 30.

Jeane Burruss added that the SOS has agreed to put together a Technical Assistance Plan to help the locals along with the process. Most of the deficiencies seem to be the lack of bringing in the system partners and including them in the plan.

Jared Bates added that what they did was to put together the common themes or issues across all of the plans. They are:

- Not enough description on overall processes and systems in place – 3 out of 4 plans.
- Few, if any, results from analysis of in-demand industry sectors and needs of employers, including knowledge and skills needed to meet employment needs – 3 out of 4 plans.
- Building partnerships with required WIOA partners – 3 out of 4 plans.
- Career Pathways – 4 out of 4 plans.

Specific plans:

- Southern Workforce Area – Local Plan
 - Plan was well developed and was the most thorough
 - All 22 criteria addressed at some level
 - 17 criteria fully addressed, 5 criteria needing additional work
 - Main Issues
 - Key development issue – Support system needed
 - Need to include all core partners in comprehensive center and the roles and resources for each
 - Co-enrollments
 - Postsecondary credential attainment
 - Local board promoting entrepreneurial skills training and microenterprise services
- Central Workforce Area – Regional Plan
 - A great deal of WIOA Legislation and Rules/Regulations included
 - 12 standards fully addressed, 10 standards needing revision
 - Main Issues
 - Did not identify skill level of workforce and skills needed in industry
 - Strengths and Weaknesses from SWOT analysis did not address the service delivery system in meeting the communities' workforce needs
 - No issues or solutions to address strengths and weaknesses from SWOT
 - No goals identified in preparing an educated and skilled workforce or related to performance accountability measures
 - No description on strategy in working with core programs and required partners
 - No sector partnership strategies identified
 - Workforce Development System

- Lack of discussion regarding K-12 to postsecondary coordination
 - Lack of coordination between all core partners
- Northeast Regional Plan
 - 11 standards fully addressed, 11 standards needing revision
 - Main Issues
 - No analysis of knowledge and skills needed to meet employer needs
 - Did not address region's capacity to meet employment needs
 - Little description on details of strategies to align resources among partners
 - Did not identify education and training providers involved with economic development
 - Industry sector partnerships were identified
 - Did not address strategies and services used to engage employers, business services to employers, manage regional rapid response activities, strengthen linkages between one-stop delivery system and unemployment insurance programs
 - Did not address Administrative Cost arrangements
- Western Regional Plan
 - 9 standards addressed, 13 standards needing revision
 - Main Issues
 - Did not address education and training programs for employment needs
 - No shared regional strategy to align available resources among the partners
 - Reference to DFCS as a partner agency in Washington State
 - Did not provide evidence of businesses and education and training providers involved with economic development
 - Did not address strategies and services used to engage employers, business services to employers, manage regional rapid response activities, strengthen linkages between one-stop delivery system and unemployment insurance programs
 - Industry sector partnerships only discusses healthcare but no other industries
 - Did not address Administrative Cost arrangements
 - Did not address coordination among the planning region for supportive services and delivery
- State Guidance
 - Co-enrollment among partners (Item B.2.c)
 - Cooperative Agreements (Item B.7)
 - Administrative Cost Sharing (Regional Item B.9)
 - Negotiated Performance
 - Core partners of the local area (Item B.10)
 - Core partners of the entire region (Item B.12)
 - High Performing Board (Item B.11)
 - Integrated Intake System (Item B.13)

Wrap-Up: DeDe added that many of the Locals/Regions said that they were waiting on guidance from the State. For example, cooperative agreements which goes along with Access for All, but many of them shared old MOUs or agreements with partner agencies that were several years old

about how they were going to partner with these agencies but they didn't address Access for All. Cost sharing is a big issue, also negotiated performance. DeDe said that she has questions on these two terms because when reviewing the plans, she wants to know what is expected? This is because in the Local Plans, they should be discussing how they are going to negotiate performance measures among the Core partners – yes? (Jeane said yes – the common measures.) So in the Regional Plan, they should be addressing negotiating the measures for the Core partners for the entire region. None of them are there yet. Under that section, they talk specifically about Title I and Wagner-Peyser. They did not mention negotiating performance measures for the Core partners.

Richard McPherson thanked DeDe and Jared and the SOS Team for all the work they have put into reviewing the plans. It is very much appreciated.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2017.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:05 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,
Linda Emrich*