

COUNCIL ON WORKFORCE INVESTMENT MEETING SUMMARY

Approved at August 4th Meeting

**Executive Committee Meeting
Teleconference -- Madison, WI**

May 9, 2005

Members Present:

Paul Linzmeyer (chair), Joel Rogers (vice chair), Roberta Gassman, Doug Moquin, Dean Welch, Tina Koehn. (Also attending for portions of the meeting were Mary P. Burke and Lee Rasch.)

Members/Committee Co chairs Absent:

Joe Gilles

Staff and Guests Present:

Sue Gleason-CWI Liaison, Sheryl Billups (staff); Connie Colussy, Dianne Reynolds, Annette Nekola (Dept. of Workforce Development); Laura Dresser (Center on Wisconsin Strategies) Jerry Hanoski (Workforce Connections); Jennifer Riggerbach (U.W. Milwaukee); Don Rouse (CWI member and WOW Workforce Development Board)

Key Issues/Discussion Items

I. Call to Order/Minutes

Paul Linzmeyer called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. Roberta Gassman moved to approve the minutes; Tina Koehn seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

II. CWI Project Proposals

A. Regional Partnership Program

Sue Gleason reviewed the proposal concept. Among issues raised in discussion were:

- *Definition of regions and threshold number (500,000).* Rogers questioned whether economic regions defined by Terry Ludeman would meet the threshold number in the proposal and Gassman asked where the 500,000 number came from. Gleason noted that information on the specific populations in economic areas was not on hand and that the economic regions outlined by Ludeman do not correspond to existing political/program boundaries. She also explained the key reasons behind the threshold number (to ensure a critical mass of people, resources needed to advance an area's economic competitiveness) and requiring Workforce Development Boards to be fiscal agents (because the project is WIA funded).
- *Use of dollars for studies.* Linzmeyer noted that funds should not be allowed to focus solely on doing a study. Rogers noted that some basic information regional partnerships will need to establish a "shared platform" for their activities may not be currently available, so some level of research/study may be needed. Gleason explained that the proposal guidelines in development will recognize these issues.
- *Targeted Industry Regional Partnerships (TIRP).* Rogers raised concerns about the option for a Targeted Industry Regional Partnership (TIRP), noting the potential for focusing on the wrong industry. He suggested that the central focus of the grant should be on the comprehensive partnerships and integration of functions.

Motion/Action: Rogers moved to adopt the Regional Partnership Program with change to strike the Targeted Industry Regional Partnership [Option A. (ii)] and focus on the Comprehensive Regional Partnerships, which may include industry partnerships. Gassman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Workforce Development Staff Competency Credentialing System

Connie Colussy briefly reviewed the Staff Competency Credentialing System proposal. Members raised questions regarding benefits and WDB involvement, with staff noting that the proposal was supported by WDBs and would provide a way to recognize/give professional status to workforce development staff, many of whom have no formal training, and advance quality customer service.

Motion/Action: Gassman moved to adopt the proposal as presented; Rasch seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

C. WDB Baldrige Express Assessment

Sheryl Billups briefly reviewed the WDB Baldrige Express Self-Assessment proposal, noting two decision items for the Committee to consider -- funding level and voluntary or required participation. Linzmeyer emphasized the value of this process in advancing partnerships/collaboration and helping to focus Board activity, suggesting that it should be mandatory. Rasch noted that it was valuable for those that wanted to participate, but results may be questionable for those who are forced to participate. In discussion of funding; members indicated that the budget should plan for full funding for all WDBs.

Motion/Action: Rogers moved to adopt the Baldrige Express proposal with change to provide full funding (C., option c) for all boards that voluntarily participate (D, second bullet, option a.). The motion was seconded by Welch and passed unanimously.

D. Milwaukee Workforce Development Landscape

Gleason reviewed the proposal, noting that the project and process used to obtain CWI consideration has generated some controversy. Gleason also noted that DWD staff are looking at the appropriate method for funding if approved by the Executive Committee. In response to questions about the project budget, Jennifer Riggerbach (U.W. Milwaukee) indicated the total budget was \$60,000. This included UW salaries (\$25,885), consultant fees (\$22,500), office supplies/materials, etc. (\$3,750), and UWM indirect costs at a rate previously approved by the Department (15%/\$7,820).

Discussion focused on the value added by the project. Among concerns raised was the lack of assessment of whether the cost of the project offered more value than similar activities by others. Rogers also questioned whether the project offered a model for reducing costs that could be replicated in other areas. Tina Koehn noted that the Systems Development Committee saw this proposal as a way to promote partnerships and reestablish the collaborations that had existed in the past. Gassman highlighted various other activities occurring in Milwaukee (including the Mayor's task force) and that this project should be connected to those efforts. Riggerbach explained that UWM has been in contact with individuals/groups noted and the project would make further connections to them.

Motion/Action: Gassman moved approval of the project; Moquin seconded the motion. The motion passed on a roll call vote. Linzmeyer, Gassman, Moquin, and Koehn voted yes; Rogers and Welch voted no. (Burke and Rasch had previously left the teleconference and did not participate.)

III. CWI Letters of Support

Gleason briefly reviewed the purpose of three letters intended to express CWI concerns about the federal budget proposals for Carl Perkins and Adult Education and transmit CWI support for the Youth Apprenticeship program and the recommendations of the Committee on Baccalaureate Expansion. She noted that all support letters were generated from the Workforce Strategies Committee.

Motion/Action: Rogers moved approval of the letters; Gassman seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

IV. WIA Two Year Plan

Gleason and Colussy provided a brief overview the WIA Two Year Plan, explaining that the Plan format/content follows specific guidance from the U.S. DOL. Linzmeyer noted comments made by Joe Gilles (Workforce System Development Committee co-chair), who had read the entire draft Plan and noted that it indicates DWD has no plans to change workforce development areas and did not mention technical college connections.

Motion/Action: Rogers moved to accept the WIA Plan; Gassman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

V. CWI Report to the Governor

Gleason explained that the CWI Report to the Governor would include both a verbal report at the June 3 meeting and a written document that would be available somewhat later. (Gassman indicated that the Governor will be available for the meeting.) Referring to the draft outline, Rogers suggested that the June 3 presentation should focus on things the Governor does not know and wouldn't need to include the background information on the CWI, the economy, and Grow Wisconsin; focus on workforce development Issues; potential measures, CWI accomplishments and action agenda. Gassman indicated the report would have a larger audience than just the Governor and should be framed by Grow Wisconsin to put CWI activities in context. Members requested that staff prepare a PowerPoint presentation reflecting the discussion.

VI. Committee and Subcommittee Reports

A. Dislocated Worker Subcommittee

Annette Nekola, subcommittee staff, reported on the subcommittee's March 21 meeting, noting that it had approved project proposals totaling \$469,000, which is the balance of the funds for this year. The subcommittee also approved a new grant application guidelines/process, which are intended to better align with U.S.DOL guidelines (to make application for federal funds easier) and to make the process more performance oriented. Nekola indicated that there continue to be significant dislocations in the state; \$ 6 million in requests will be reviewed at the subcommittee's next meeting on May 23. She also noted that funding for the next program year (starting July 1, 2005) has been reduced by 5% (\$600,000); formula funding between WDAs is also shifting, with four WDAs receiving more funds, while the remaining will stay the same or have reduced funding (including Milwaukee).

B. Workforce Systems Development Committee

Tina Koehn provided a brief report on the Committee's last meeting on April 22. She noted that it was a productive meeting and that a subcommittee has been established to focus on Milwaukee issues.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.