

**State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB)
 January 18, 2013
 Frances Perkins Conference Room
 Maine Department of Labor
 Augusta Maine**

Topic	Introduction of State Workforce Investment Board Members and Guests; Approval of the Minutes
	<p>Present: Fred Webber, Peter Paré, Carolyn Lockwood, Brian Whitney, Craig Larrabee, Steve Pound, Kevin Healey, Tracey Cooley, Barbara Woodlee, Renee Kelly, Susan Corbett, Joanne Harris, Gail Senese, Susan Hammond, Dan Muth, Gerard Salvo, Liz Ray, Scott Good, Don Berry, Rob Carmichael, Bill Burney, Ed McKersie, Wayne Holmquist and Mel Clarrage</p> <p>Guests: Richard Freund, Ginny Carroll, Michael Aube, Jen Brooks, Jon Farley, Sallie Chandler, Michael Bourret, Antoinette Mancusi, Joanna Russell, Jim Trundy, Richard Fifield, Bethany Campbell, Jeff Sneddon, Phil Dionne, Ryan Pelletier, Bob Clark</p> <p>Staff: Garret Oswald (on the phone)</p>
Discussion	<p>Fred Webber called the meeting to order at 9:05 am with welcomes and introductions. Sam McKeeman from the Department of Administration and Financial Services facilitated the meeting. Ground rules were reviewed; one person at a time speaks, follow the agenda, ask questions, clarify and seek understanding.</p> <p>Richard Freund confirmed that everyone was in receipt of the proposed policy draft. Pete Paré circulated a list of activities since the last board meeting. Members were thanked for their participation in the work groups and meeting that were held around the state.</p> <p>Fred summarized the events that had taken place in the process of revising and resubmitting the Five-Year WIA Strategic Plan 2012-2016. He informed the SWIB that the Plan would be posted that afternoon for public comment and the Plan would be formally submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor on January 30, in order to allow them 90 days to approve the plan for an April 30 deadline.</p> <p>Garret Oswald advised that the current submission is a compilation of everything that was worked on last year, input that people provided, major points, however, the waiver is no longer part of the plan. SWIB voted and approved this last year without the waiver language. Policy recommendations will be reviewed later today and will become part of the plan.</p> <p>Bill Burney asked what Governor's authority's is and the impact on workforce training in Maine. Garret advised that the Governor is the authority that signs and submits the plan. The Governor signs, receives the funding and disburses to the</p>

	<p>state workforce agency. Discussion followed on what could transpire if the plan is not approved and submitted. Clarification was made that [they] did not appeal.</p> <p>Steve Pound asked, “What are the LWIB’s roles and responsibilities and their involvement? The response was that the Plan being submitted is essentially the same as the one submitted in September but with the waiver language deleted, along with whatever comes out of today’s meeting for policy recommendations.</p>
--	---

Topic	Policy Recommendations
Discussion	Mr. Webber circulated draft copies of proposed Policy and Procedures and advised that members will discuss, review and vote on each subject matter

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Minimum Training Expenditure Requirement for WIA
Discussion	<p>The definition of training was discussed along with what the SWIB values as training. Garret advised the definition of training follows the federal definition of training FR40 which has three line items. 1) Tuition assistance; 2) OJT; and 3) customized training. Mike Bourret stated that the definition of training has to include the impact that it will have on the percentages. Training money, staff, and space is part of that formula. Bob Carmichael asked what types of training are not covered. Garret advised softer skills types such as resume workshops, interviews, and career exploration do not fall within the federal definition of training.</p> <p>Lengthy discussion followed regarding training, performance measures, standards, percentages, service providers, and state goals and meeting criteria.</p> <p>Garret explained how the percentages were developed along with measurements performance matrixes. Discussion followed on realistic performance training figures for area’s around the state. Garret referred everyone to form FR40, an attachment to the draft policy.</p> <p>Pete explained the FR40 (fiscal reporting tool) definition: tuition training, on-the-job training, and customized training. Support services are picked up under training which includes clothing, medical, housing, transportation, child care, needs related payment, and all other support services.</p> <p>Core intensive training issues as defined on the ETA website were brought up. Richard Freund advised that there are Wagner-Peyser funds, WIA funds, numerous other agencies and departments that fund soft skill development. The purpose of the SWIB is to unite the workforce development efforts occurring across the state in various departments and agencies. Need to be more cooperative and collaborative and how to accomplish this.</p> <p>Fred Webber advised that the Governor is monitoring the training expenditures and cannot understand why only 20% of the money is going into training.</p>

	<p>Pete advised that he did an analysis of the state wide average which would be 30% and believes is achievable. Calculations were based on the money spent, not the money allocated. Members asked if the percentage goals set are realistic to meet and what would be the consequences if not met.</p> <p>Garret responded this is new to the state and they'd learn as they go. He added that Maine wants to make sure that the methodology is appropriate, which is why there are metrics and the law requires that there are sanctions for the failure to meet performance measures.</p> <p>After a short break, Renee Kelly moved to change the formula where it identifies the training expenditure rate as the "Training sub-total plus support services sub-total equals training expenditure rate total," and to change the denominator to "total one year expenditures." Garret expressed concern with that due to "carry ins" from year to year. Renee amended the motion to "total annual expenditures." This will include "carry ins."</p> <p>Garret explained that they looked at a number of other states and they all were 30 to 50 percent depending on when they started.</p> <p>Lengthy discussion followed on how and where training money is spent and how percentages are calculated and collaboration on best use of dollars.</p> <p>Mel Clarrage expressed concern regarding timing and chance to keep dollars, to keep programs going or they might have no money at all. He expressed hope that this debate stops and move forward.</p>	
Conclusion	<p>Renee restated her motion as follows: Change training denominator to "total annual expenditures." Change line 2 under Performance Goals, strike out "then to," and add "after PY13 while exploring the appropriate training definitions." Strike the second paragraph completely under Performance Goals and include "The goal is to move the statewide average Training Expenditure Rate up to 30 percent in PY12 and then to 40 percent by PY13 while exploring the definition of 'training.'"</p> <p>Steve Pound seconded the motion.</p> <p>The vote was 12 in favor, two opposed (Mel, Brian Whitney), including Pete Paré's vote on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted 5 in favor and three opposed (Dan Muth, Liz ray, Bill Burney) and one abstention (Meg Harvey).</p>	
Action Items: SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote	Persons responsible: SWIB staff	Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Approval of Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs)	
Discussion	<p>Jeff Sneddon wanted to know how LWIBs can be approved without performance goals. Garret responded that we are going to have standards and will work to develop those over the course of this year. The Bureau of Employment Services is responsible for conducting the approval process.</p> <p>Garret added that there is a movement across the country where states are certifying career centers as well as their staff, LWIBs and boards, along with others. Putting in place a certification process in our system would help ensure consistent quality across the state. More discussion followed. It was noted that the policy’s guidance states that after conducting the process, recommendations will be delivered to the SWIBs.</p>	
Conclusion	<p>Rob Carmichael moved that the policy be approved with the following correction to the draft: “After conducting an approval process for a CareerCenter, <u>an LWIB</u>, the BES will deliver its recommendations to the SWIB. Recommendations can include approval, conditional approval, or revocation of approval. If circumstances warrant, the BES may issue another type of recommendation to the SWIB.” Ed McKersie seconded the motion.</p> <p>The motion carried with a vote of 12 in favor with none opposed. Pete Paré voted in favor on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted nine in favor and none opposed.</p>	
Action Items: SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote	Persons responsible: SWIB staff	Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Certification of One-Stop CareerCenters	
Discussion	<p>Fred asked how the SWIB can vote on this policy in the absence of performance goals. Garret responded that they are not approving goals but rather the concept that we think it will be a good idea to have consistency in terms of accessibility, hours, professionalism and credentials of staff. Mike Bourret stated that there may be a conflict of interest. Garret responded that they would have to adjust who would be on that work group.</p> <p>Pete commented that he has observed the lack of consistency across all Career Centers and suggested that BES develop metrics for all Career Centers for consistency across the state. Richard stated that all the entities should be folded under the guidance and jurisdiction of SWIB. Steve reminded members of conflict of interest and to be careful not to put BES in an awkward position because they are a service provider too.</p> <p>Mike Bourret asked how this certification will affect service providers. Garret responded that these are issues to be addressed by the Program Policy committee. There was further conversation regarding SWIB’s oversight responsibilities and</p>	

	accountability.	
Conclusion	<p>Ed McKersie moved to approve the policy. Tracy Cooley seconded. Liz Ray pointed out some typographical and spelling errors: “One-stop CareerCenters are required to be certified biennially as meeting service delivery standards jointly developed by the Bureau of Employment Services and the Program Policy Policy Committee of the SWIB.” and “After conducting a certification process for a CareerCenter, the BES will deliver its recommendations to the SWIB. Recommendations can include certification, <u>certification conditional</u>.”</p> <p>Vote: Program Policy Committee: 8 in favor. None oppose. Motion carried. Board vote: 14 in favor. None opposed. Motion carried.</p> <p>The motion carried with a vote of 14 in favor with none opposed. Pete Paré voted in favor on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted eight in favor and none opposed.</p>	
Action Items:	SWIB staff will correct the typos and spelling errors in the policy.	Persons responsible: SWIB staff Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Data Collection and Reporting	
Discussion	<p>It was requested that the One Flow be defined. Pete explained that it is the new data reporting and operating system that will be used and incorporated into the Plan.</p> <p>Richard stated that several performance measurement dashboards had been developed which would summarize various entities. Different programs use different performance standards. For example, what the policy committee might want to see might be different than what chambers and other users might want to see.</p>	
Conclusion	<p>Ed McKersie moved to accept the policy. Scott Good seconded. The motion was amended to read, “The SWIB, in collaboration with the Bureau of Employment Services (BES) is responsible for collecting the reported data and entering it into the as yet undetermined <u>OneFlow and other appropriate databases where capturable</u> for further reporting and analysis.</p> <p>The motion, as amended, carried unanimously. Pete Paré voted on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which also voted unanimously in favor.</p>	
Action Items:	SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote	Persons responsible: SWIB staff Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Obtaining a letter of support when applying for any funds that will include leveraging resources or programs funded by the Workforce Investment Act.	
Discussion	<p>Fred informed the SWIB that concerns about the SWIB’s ability to enforce this policy had been voiced at Policy Work Group meeting. Garret responded that it could be included in the criteria as part of the certification process. They are looking for coordination and consistency across the state entities.</p> <p>Fred added that the SWIB should have a grasp of what is going on and by requiring a letter of support, would be able to track activities.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding collaboration and coordination on letters of support and the SWIB’s responsibility. Steve Pound asserted that you cannot mandate collaboration. You need to work together and have a good faith effort for things to take place. It was noted that it’s common practice to ask for letters of support but you don’t want to be required to do it. Also, it was noted that there is value in notifying the SWIB which advises them that there’s other opportunities and can coordinate efforts of multiple agencies collaborating together on a grant, etc.</p> <p>Fred suggested keeping the policy in place and rewording it to stress collaboration, cooperation, and coordination and remove the mandate language.</p> <p>The consensus was that there being not enough time to rewrite this section, it should be tabled for further consideration.</p>	
Conclusion	<p>Wayne Holmquist moved that the policy should be revised and then come back to the SWIB for consideration. Steve Pound seconded the motion.</p> <p>The motion carried unanimously. Pete Paré voted on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted 8 in favor of, and one opposed (Liz Ray) to, the motion.</p>	
Action Items: SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote.	Persons responsible: SWIB staff	Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Chambers of Commerce as required partners in local workforce areas	
Discussion	<p>There was discussion on the requirement of an MOU vs. requiring a contract. Steve commented that legally this would have to be posted for an RFP. Richard advised that the intent is not to contract or create an MOU with all chambers across the state. Within the regions, the LWIBs work more closely with the chambers.</p> <p>The draft wording states “<u>all of the local chambers of commerce.</u>” There was a general sense that, along with the chambers, other associations that should be</p>	

included, such as Associated General Contractors. Richard explained the Governor's association with the Chambers of Commerce.

Steve suggested new language as follows:

In the Background section of the draft policy, "To increase collaboration and foster stronger partnerships between workforce development activities and economic development activities, this policy requires a formal, ~~contractual~~ relationship, such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), between Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) and their local Chambers of Commerce."

Steve moved to accept the amended policy language. Wayne Holmquist seconded.

The motion carried unanimously, with Pete Pare voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which also voted unanimously to support the motion.

After discussion about the Policy section of the draft policy, Steve suggested the following revision:

In the Policy section of the draft policy: "Local Workforce Investment Boards are ~~required~~ encouraged to contract or develop MOU's where appropriate with all of the local Chambers of Commerce and other associations within their areas to establish and maintain programs, services, and activities.

"As part of the ~~contracting-~~ agreement process, LWIBs and local Chambers will negotiate activities to be implemented by both parties. Any funds provided to the Chambers will not be considered training funds or supportive service funds (as defined in Policy #2013-01)."

Ed McKersie moved to approve the revised policy section. Renee Kelly seconded. The motion carried unanimously, with Pete Pare voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which also voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Discussion occurred regarding chambers jointly agreeing with metrics and removing the wording contract throughout this section.

Steve suggested changing the language to "mutually" agreed upon when appropriate.

Steve moved to amend the draft policy as follows: "Performance goals will be ~~contractually~~ mutually agreed to by the LWIBs and Chambers of Commerce and other associations when applicable."

_____ moved to accept Steve's language.

_____ seconded.

Meg suggested that stronger language was needed and would abstain from voting.

	The motion carried unanimously, with Pete Paré voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted 8 in favor and 1 abstention (Meg Harvey).	
Conclusion	_____ moved to approve the policy with all the amendments that had been voted upon. Mel Clarrage seconded. The motion passed unanimously, with Pete Paré voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which voted 6 in favor, 2 opposed (Brian Whitney and Bill Burney) and 1 abstention (Meg Harvey).	
Action Items: SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote.	Persons responsible: SWIB staff	Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	DRAFT Policy: Promotion and availability of entrepreneurship training as a required service	
Discussion	<p>There was concern about LWIB’s being forced to join the chambers as well as economic development districts unless financial arrangements can be made.</p> <p>It was suggested that in the Guidance section of the draft policy, economic development districts be added to bullet six. Amended, it would read as follows:</p> <p>“Referrals to adult education programs; higher education business programs; other business courses; Maine Centers for Women, Work, and Community; and agencies such as the Small Business Administration, Procurement Technical Assistance Center, Coastal Enterprises Incorporated, Maine SCORE, <u>Economic Development Districts</u>, and others.”</p> <p>Steve suggested changing the wording in the Performance Goals section of the draft policy from “negotiated between” to “mutually agreed among...” to read as follows:</p> <p>“In the first year of this policy’s implementation, baseline metrics will be reported on the Performance Scorecard. Those indicators will be evaluated and used to establish future performance objectives to be negotiated between <u>mutually agreed to among</u> LWIBs, CareerCenters, and partner agencies. “</p>	
Conclusion	<p>Ed McKersie moved to approve policy as amended. Steve seconded.</p> <p>The motion carried unanimously, with Pete Paré voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee, which also voted unanimously in favor of the motion.</p>	
Action Items: SWIB staff will revise the policy to reflect the results of the discussion and vote.	Persons responsible: SWIB staff	Deadline: none recorded, but as soon as possible

Topic	Adjournment of Retreat
Discussion	<p>At the conclusion of the previous discussions, Chair Fred Webber advised that the SWIB would meet to cover other business.</p> <p>He also described the process underway for the submission of the WIA Five-Year State Workforce Development Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan will be posted at midnight for public comment on the web under the State of Maine. • Governor will make decision. • Plan will be sent to Washington <p>Pete advised that there are two elements: Governor accepting and submitting the plans and the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) approving the plan. The USDOL can either approved or reject what is submitted.</p>
Conclusion	Hearing no objections, the Chair adjourned the retreat and the SWIB reconvened.

Topic	Approval of Minutes from October 26, 2012 SWIB meeting
Discussion	<p>As Chairman of the Board, Fred asked for approval of the Minutes of October 26th.</p> <p>Steve asked if there are minutes of the previous meeting, notes, tapes. Answer was no, they were not. Steve stated that meetings need to be recorded because there are motions and votes made. He will not vote without minutes not knowing what motions and votes are especially when there were three points of the resolution discussed that went to the Governor.</p> <p>Richard stated the future meetings will be recorded and minutes will be provided approximately two weeks for comment and corrections.</p> <p>Garret expressed concern regarding the commitment just made as he doesn't have staff capacity to achieve this. They do their best capturing discussions and respectfully suggested that a volunteer take minutes.</p>
Conclusion	<p>Ed McKersie moved to accept the October 26, 2012 meeting minutes. Scott Good seconded.</p> <p>The motion passed with one vote opposed (Steve Pound) and 3 abstenions. (_____, _____, and ____). Pete Paré voted on behalf of the Program Policy Committee.</p>

Topic	Approval of Draft Policies
Discussion	Fred asked for a motion to approve the polices that were just worked on over the past five hours.

Conclusion	Steve moved to accept the policies just reviewed. Wayne Holmquist . The motion passed unanimously, with Pete Paré voting on behalf of the Program Policy Committee.
-------------------	--

Topic	Upcoming Meetings and Adjournment
Discussion	<p>Schedule for Next Board Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 22 • May 24 • July 19 • September 27 <p>Members were asked to think of agenda items for the March meeting. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for workforce development in the bond packages, i.e., east-west highway. • Future speakers. • Should there be business support for work ready programs. • Discuss responsibility of county commissioners at future meetings. <p>Fred asked if there was anything else to come before the board.</p> <p>Garret advised that there is a video about available at YouTube and will send the link to everyone for them to spread the word and network with other venues.</p> <p>Richard advised that there are copies of the Executive Summary available on the table in the front of the room. He noted that Plan, it is vital that the county commissioners to be on board with the Plan to support and designate LWIBs, which is a critically important area.</p> <p>Bill Burney thanked Fred for his assistance today which helped tremendously moving forward.</p>
Conclusion	Tracy Cooley moved to adjourn the meeting. _____ seconded. Hearing no objections. Chair Fred Webber adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.