

Governor's Council on Workforce Investment

Ad Hoc Committee (Milwaukee)

Meeting Notice

**Friday
December 9, 2005**

**Immediately Following the Workforce System Development Committee
Meeting**

**Concourse Hotel
University Room C-D
1 West Dayton Street
Madison, WI
(608) 257-6000**

AGENDA:

- 1. Approval of the Minutes of November 14, 2005 (Attached)**
- 2. UWM Status Report**
- 3. Discussion of Draft Report Outline (Attached)**
- 4. Formulation of Recommendations (Attached stakeholder summary)**

For further information, contact Committee staff: Linda Williamson, telephone (608) 261-6394, E-mail: linda.williamson@dwd.state.wi.us

If you have other special needs such as assistance to access materials in an alternate format including large print, or you need an interpreter, please contact Gloria Kirchoff: gloria.kirchoff@dwd.state.wi.us, or call her at (608) 267-2191.

Agenda Item # 1

Pending Approval

Workforce System Development Committee

AD HOC COMMITTEE (Milwaukee)

Minutes of November 14, 2005
Milwaukee

Members present: Thomas Burse, Bill Clingan, Tina Koehn, Don Rouse, Josh Zepnick.

CWI staff present: Mary Pasholk, Pamela O'Brien.

Others present: Christopher Ruud; Sheryl Billups; Jennifer Riggerbach and Sammis White, UWM Center for Workforce Development; Sheila Knox and Lea Collins-Worachek, Job Service.

Mr. Burse, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

Agenda Item #1

Representative Zepnick, seconded by Ms. Koehn, moved to approve the minutes of October 12, 2005. The motion unanimously passed.

As a follow-up to the full Committee's request and discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the timeline agreed to at the last meeting which will be the "deliverables" for the December 9, 2005 Workforce System Development Committee meeting. Representative Zepnick expressed his belief that the Ad Hoc Committee had been cost-effective in the manner it proceeded with its charge. In addition, Committee members stressed how vital it was to have some mechanism in place to monitor progress during the implementation phase and to assess the impacts on the system.

Agenda Item #2

Ms. Riggerbach and Dr. White discussed their status report on the preliminary findings from the "stakeholder" interviews and circulated a summary. The major themes were:
"If Milwaukee is going to improve its economic position, the invested Milwaukee community requires a cohesive, continuum of services;
The "system" is complicated, uncoordinated, and fragmented with unclear goals;
There is a complete lack of communication and understanding of what each provider does or is designed to do;
Competition among providers is fierce and problematic;
Most job seekers are unprepared and face strong barriers to employment;
Broader consideration needs to be given as to how employer engagement can best occur;
Leadership is needed."

Agenda Item #3

The Chair reported that he received a booklet of material from the Private Industry Council of Milwaukee County, Inc. Job Center Network Committee, and staff will provide pertinent information to Committee members.

Agenda Item #4

Mr. Ruud stated that he was very impressed with the contributions from UWM and the coordination with the Ad Hoc Committee. At his request, Dr. White agreed to present a power point in January on their grant report and final recommendations. There was further discussion about how UWM's products would fold into the Committee's work as well as the timelines. Mr. Rouse emphasized the need to develop very specific recommendations based on the common themes.

By consensus, the schedule included:

December 9, 2005 meeting in Madison following the full Committee meeting;

Mid-January 2006 circulate preliminary draft report;

January 26, 2006, 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. in Milwaukee for UWM presentation; review draft report; discuss coordination with economic development efforts and other workforce activities such as the Grow Grant;

Early February 2006 finalize report and hold press conference with UWM in Milwaukee. Invite all players to participate in some way with this effort;

Mid-February 2006 present report to full Committee;

Tentatively, March 16, 2006 in Milwaukee to present report to the Council on Workforce Investment.

Given that UWM's preliminary findings from the interviews were reflective of those the Committee heard from the listening sessions, members wanted to ensure that both pieces be incorporated into their final report. **Representative Zepnick moved, seconded by Ms. Koehn, that DWD staff proceed on formulating the draft report and working with UWM. The motion unanimously passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Agenda Item # 3

Draft *Ad Hoc* Committee Report Outline

- I. Background
 - a. History
 - b. Charge
 - c. Membership

- II. Fact Finding and Coordination
 - a. Stakeholder Input
 - b. University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee Project
 - c. Themes

- III. Recommendations

Appendix A Stakeholder and Other Participant List

Appendix B University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Project Summary

Appendix C Chart on Recommendations, Action Steps, Monitoring Status

AGENDA ITEM # 4 (December 9, 2005 Ad Hoc Committee)

SUMMARY TO KICK OFF DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS (As report by CWI Committee staff at the September 16, 2005 Meeting)

Themes Used by the Ad Hoc Committee

Leadership within the community and among the Workforce Development Board
Collaboration/coordination with workforce partners and external entities for effective service delivery
Alignment of common goals
Overcoming "silo-program" funding
Linkages to economic development initiatives and labor market projections

Dominant Themes from the Ad Hoc Listening Sessions

Put the "one-stop" back into the One-Stops (Job Centers): Design and implement a truly one-stop service delivery system for all customers (employers and job seekers) that transcend program funding. This will require leadership from the Executive Branch and top local elected officials (to ensure consistent messages/policies across programs) with input from the local staff for the reconstruction of an efficient seamless delivery system.

Establish a task force of workforce partners with high-level employers and policy-makers at the table to identify common solutions for an improved delivery system:

- (a) Develop goals with measurable outcomes for cross-program activities that would be grounded in their local plans, state and local policies, etc. as part of joint-planning and resource-sharing;
- (b) Design procedures/processes for activity implementation that ensures efficiencies; and
- (c) Focus activities to support key economic development efforts.

Establish a creative consortium of workforce partners that expands the current WBD/PIC collaborators (such as Manpower) to improve and increase training services for job placement in construction, skilled trades, health care and emerging industries across all programs with cross-partner/employer involvement for:

- (a) short-term training along with appropriate job placement support (such as English as a second language); and
- (b) long-term training after job placement to meet continued private sector skill needs and improve the self-sufficiency of employees.

In addition, the consortium would identify blended funding mechanisms to support these focused training activities.

The need for a formal leadership team (with discretionary funds) that meets regularly comprised of key operations program managers to:

- (a) identify joint activities with measurable outcomes (such as specific training needs of job seekers) and implement strategies across programs;
- (b) link with employers and economic development players on a regular basis; and
- (c) establish common solutions to improve infrastructure issues (such as co-sharing of resources).

The need for regional strategies and planning on training and employment placement activities including collaborating on joint grant proposals, finance mechanisms, and revising state and federal requirements that are impediments for cross-program cooperation and service delivery. Coordinate with the Greater Milwaukee Regional Economic Council.

Additional Suggestions from UWM's Interviews with Foundation and Other Funding Entities
(As reported by UWM staff at the October 12, 2005 Meeting)

A. The Milwaukee County Workforce Development System is viewed as complicated and confusing for the individuals, employers, and the general community.

Suggestions for improving the Milwaukee system:

- Define the expectations for success. Base expectations on data and research.
- Acknowledge competition.
- Approach jobs, training, and support systems as a continuum. All need to be addressed to move people out of poverty and provide employers with good employees.
- Create a common intake or screening process in the system.

B. Leadership and Accountability are viewed as lacking. Specific recommendations:

- Educate themselves on the accountability standards and organizations providing services.
- Demand follow through and accountability to the Milwaukee Community.
- Any direct recommendations on bringing stakeholders together to improve leadership and accountability should be backed with real financial resources.
- Leverage funding opportunities to back this effort.

C. Employers need to be engaged. Specific recommendations:

- Provide a similar process to the stakeholder interviews to gain the insights of employers and learn ways to effectively engage them.
- Engage MMAC and the PIC Board to garner employer participation and support for improvement efforts.

D. Serious education is needed on the part of job seekers. Specific recommendations:

- Make a recommendation that job seekers can go to school and still garner supportive benefits such as child care subsidies, food stamps and stipends.
- Recommend more training options for both individuals and employers seeking to train and provide mentoring to incumbent workers.

UWM's Preliminary Findings from the Stakeholder Interviews (As reported by UWM staff at the November 14, 2005 Meeting)

- If Milwaukee is going to improve its economic position, the invested Milwaukee community requires a cohesive, continuum of services.
- The "system" is complicated, uncoordinated, and fragmented with unclear goals.
- There is a complete lack of communication and understanding of what each provider does or is designed to do.
- Competition among providers is fierce and problematic.
- Most job seekers are unprepared and face strong barriers to employment.
- Broader consideration needs to be given as to how employer engagement can best occur.
- Leadership is needed.