Item 3. Action

a) **Approve May 8, 2013 State Board Meeting Summary**

b) **Approve Eligible Training Provider List Policy**

c) **Approve Additional Performance Measures**

California Workforce Investment Board
May 8, 2013 Meeting Summary

Members Present:

Jonathon Andrus
Robert Barragan
Robert Beitcher
Monica Blanco-Etheridge
John Brauer
Ken Burt
Jerry Butkiewicz
Bill Camp
Jamil Dada
Shannon Eddy
Diane Factor
Imran Farooq
Allen Fernandez Smith
Larry Frank
Mike Gallo
Pam Harris
Chris Hill
Pamela Kan
Michael Kelly
Ro Khanna
Steve Levy
Laura Long
James Mangia
Karl Mehta
Brian McMahon for Marty Morgenstern
Stephen Monteros
The Honorable Kevin Mullin
Nathan Nayman
Catherine O'Bryant
The Honorable Henry Perea
Tim Rainey
Diane Ravnik
Bob Redlo
Ulysses Romero
Mike Rossi
Richard Rubin
The Honorable Rudy Salas
Alma Salazar
Hermelinda Sapien
Jeremy Smith
Anette Smith-Dohring
Abby Snay
Jim Suennen for Diana Dooley
Van Ton-Quinlivan for Brice Harris
Floyd Trammel
Joseph Wiliams
The Honorable Roderick Wright
Carol Zabin

Chair Mike Rossi convened the meeting at 10:00 AM. A quorum was present. Executive Director Tim Rainey introduced the 12 new board members appointed since the February meeting. Mr. Rossi welcomed and invited U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) Region 6 Administrator Virginia Hamilton to say a few words. Ms. Hamilton welcomed the newly reconstituted State Board; stated that DOL expects Labor Secretary nominee Thomas Perez to be confirmed soon; and that Assistant Secretary Jane Oates is leaving at the end of May. Ms. Hamilton also stated that DOL Region 6 work is very aligned with the State Board and Community College Chancellor's efforts related to sector strategies, identifying skills gaps, etc. Ms. Hamilton advised that sequestration is an issue and that California received a 3% overall reduction, which is less than most other states. Lastly, Ms. Hamilton urged California to apply for Trade Adjustment Act grants and stated that California's State Plan will be approved.

Mr. Rainey welcomed and introduced Assembly members Kevin Mullin and Rudy Salas as the designated representatives from the State Assembly.

1. **Public Comment**
   Mr. Rossi asked for public comment. There were no public comments.

2. **Action Items**

   a) **Approval of February Meeting Summary**

   Mr. Rossi asked for a motion, it was moved by Mr. Camp and seconded. The item was unanimously approved with minor administrative corrections.

   b) **Approval of State Performance Measures**

   Mr. Rossi introduced this item and asked for a motion. Mr. Brauer moved for approval, a second was provided by Mr. Camp. There was some discussion on this item. Larry Frank asked 2 questions: 1) Leverage funds – tracking WIA related funds only will cause an unintended direction towards the use of Individual Training Accounts (ITA). Mr. Frank asked the committee to understand these unintended consequences and went on to say that the State has to trust local partnerships developed by the local boards. 2) Most performance numbers only track case managed placements (5000 per year in Los Angeles) and not the 25000 universal access placements. Mr. Frank stated the system needs to move towards a universal enrollment strategy and offered to share his placement data with the State Board.

   Mr, Rainey explained the Performance Ad hoc Workgroup and how they will be handling this. The Executive Committee approved these high level outcomes and wants to look at the broader workforce system, not just WIA.

   Carol Zabin commented on the living wage performance indicator that it is important to consider it by sector. Ms. Zabin stated that we do not want public workforce dollars going to undermine other higher paying sectors or higher paying jobs within the sector. In other words, we shouldn't always go for the poorer jobs in the sector.

   John Brauer commented on the self-sufficiency measure and how it is calculated. The cost of living varies greatly in parts of California and that needs to be taken into consideration.

   Mr. Rossi provided his observation that different definitions are being used for sustainability, high-quality, etc. As the State Board moves forward we need a measurable commonality of language and to move from word-smithing documents to actual implementation. Mr. Rossi asked the following questions: Can we measure performance? Do we know what performance is? He urged the members to stay focused on the citizens

who need our services to survive and to remember that in performing the activities necessary to help the people. He concluded saying the State Board's job is not writing papers and arguing about documents, but whether or not we did something worthwhile to change the lives of Californians and their children. We need to get to plans that really drive change.

Mr. Rossi asked for a vote on the performance measures. They were unanimously approved.

c) Approve Committee Reports

Advanced Manufacturing Workforce Development Council
Mr. Khanna summarized the committee's activities. The written report is included in the agenda. Mr. Rossi asked some clarifying questions related to performance metrics and Mr. Khanna agreed.

Career Pathways and Education Committee
Mr. Gallo summarized the committee's activities. The written report is included in the agenda. Mr. Camp asked some questions regarding how participants are selected to reduce the fallout rate. Abby Snay stated youth in special education are usually left out and urged their inclusion in the programs supported by the committee. Ms. Ravnik noted that a theme is emerging as both committee reports and the state plan are all calling for industry recognized credentials. Mr. Brauer asked that the committee discuss with the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCO) the reporting they are doing around accountability and transparency. Mr. Rossi recommended the following specifics be added to the report: define career-based; describe how each bullet will happen and who will do what; define career-oriented learning environments; define leveraged; and define key employers. Laura Long commented on the Health Workforce Development Council's (HWDC) career pathways work and hopes this committee can do similar. Mr. Williams suggested adding verbiage related to building work experience through service learning/community service.

Health Workforce Development Council
Mr. Redlo summarized the committee's activities. The written report is included in the agenda. Mr. Nayman asked how the council will coordinate with the needs of the health care exchange. He also asked if the council could report to the Issues and Policies Committee (IPSC). Mr. Redlo stated that healthcare employers are well aware of their needs to provide healthcare services under the Affordable Care Act.

Green Collar Jobs Council

Ms. Zabin summarized the committee's activities. The written report is included in the agenda. Mr. Farooq asked if there is a mechanism to incorporate these shared principles among reciprocal committees on the energy policy side. Ms. Zabin replied there is no mechanism at this time but they are working on it. Mr. Fernandez Smith offered youth assistance. Senator Wright stated we want to develop skills training in broad occupations as most green occupation clusters stem from broader occupations. Ms. Sapien asked if the committee has looked at any labor market data to see if the job creation in green jobs is living up to all the hype. Mr. Rossi also provided some input.

Issues and Policies Committee

Mr. Camp summarized his committee's activities as well as the ETPL and Performance ad hoc committees. The written report is included in the agenda. Van Ton-Quinlivan noted the CCCO is not listed in the summary regarding the ETPL committee and should be listed. Ms. Smith-Dohring asked if the private providers will meet the industry professional standards as well as Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) standards. Mr. Rainey explained the intent of the ETPL performance standards.

4. **Discussion**

a) State and Local Board Member Campaign

Mr. Rossi opened by saying the State Board needs to go out and sell its strategic plan through a campaign of talking with the local boards on a regular basis. The campaign document deals with each member being assigned to a local board. Mr. Rossi opened the floor for discussion. Mr. Brauer stated it is a great idea related to best practices, utilization of Individual Training Accounts (ITA) and training dollars to meet the 25% training expenditure requirement. Mr. McMahon he feels it is important that there be a structured, systematic way the State Board can be informed by this individual dialogue. Mr. Trammell agreed and Ms. Ravnik concurred. Mr. Levy suggested getting 3-4 local board executive directors together to discuss this before the campaign starts to keep it positive. Mr. Rossi stated he would like to invite local board chairs to State Board meetings. Ms. Salazar agreed that local directors should be solicited for their input.

Mr. Nayman suggested we step back briefly and come up with a plan that the State Board can push out urging the general public to engage with their local board and that the State Board needs to consider and encourage the general public to weigh in locally first. Mr. Levy said there are 2 parallel forces (workers needing help and employers needing workers) that need to see a common interest otherwise they do not communicate with each other. Mr. Hill agreed that local boards, employers and workers need to be consulted. Mr. Dada stated

as a local board Chair, the local boards are anxious to hear from the State Board. Mr. Barragan questioned the goal of this initiative. Mr. Rossi clarified that the State Board does not communicate well with local boards and that there needs to be a partnership predicated on trust and respect. Mr. Barragan acknowledged the State Board is taking a new approach and asked if it is trying to get the 49 local boards to adopt it as well? Mr. Rossi replied yes, this is essentially a cultural change through creating trusting relationships as partners.

Mr. Gallo stated this is a value proposition not a compliance issue and that a shared vision is critical. Ms. Blanco-Etheridge agreed this is key and that the Board should move forward with a common message. She furthered that in Fresno there is a disconnect between the local board and the services they provide to the people. Ms. Ms. Salazar stated what is missing is how the State Board will support the local boards in this effort. Mr. Rossi reiterated he is not talking about just one meeting, but regular meetings. Mr. Lanter of the California Workforce Association (CWA) stated it is a great idea and that local boards do not want to be anxious about what the State Board is doing. Rather, they want the State Board to understand what their needs are. Having a two-way street is important. Mr. Lanter offered to connect some local directors into this effort. Ms. Long strongly encouraged a mechanism for bringing local input back to the State Board. Ms. Ravnik suggested the State Board Chair issue a letter to the Local Boards. Mr. Rossi will send a joint letter with CWA. Mr. Williams asked about the State Board's capacity to respond, in terms of resources and staffing, to requests for capacity building support from local boards. He expressed concern about collecting all this input and then not coming back with anything. Virginia Hamilton stated DOL will try to find resources to help this effort as well as waivers and policy changes.

Ms. Kan stated that most people looking for jobs and employers would not understand what we are talking about. There is no callout as to who is going to do the work in any of the documents. Ms. Kan stated she wants to see fewer words and to get things done and check off accomplishments. In other words, boil it down and make it simple in a language everyone understands. Ms. O'Bryant stated that the consensus appears to be that local boards are not doing well, therefore there needs to be policy guidance coming from the State Board. As a business owner, Ms. O'Bryant suggested going to the local boards to identify successful programs and how those successful programs get workers and employers together. In other words, approach it from the bottom up, not from the top down. Mr. Rossi disagreed by saying that we are trying to effectuate a particular change that moves the State Board to a more metrics-driven system of measuring 49 local boards similarly. He asked how we drive statewide, the behaviors that create middle skill jobs and that the issue is not whether or not we are driving what local boards are doing, but whether or not measurements are consistent, and are incenting the mid-level skill sets needed. Ms.

Harris agreed this is a change to approaching workforce investment and that the state needs to help the local boards find the way and listen to identify what the State Board can do to help them. Ms. Harris went on to say the State Board will be more of a convener and a facilitator for an integrated approach, and to be effective, it must be clear on its expectations and help the local boards to get there. He suggested we proceed with this initiative and pledged that we will get our written reports much more specific.

b) City of Los Angeles Report – Building a Stronger Los Angeles Workforce
Larry Frank discussed this report.

c) Economic Analysis – State Strategic Workforce Development Plan
Steve Levy reviewed the workforce and economic analysis chapter (Chapter II) of the Strategic Plan.

d) Local Sector Overlay/Survey Results
Executive Director Rainey discussed the overlay, which was requested at the February meeting.

3. INFORMATION

The members were asked to review the following informational items included in their meeting materials:

a) Youth Career Technical Education Manufacturing Skills Pilot – Request for Application
b) 25% Dislocated Worker Project – Central Valley Employment Initiative
c) Local Strategic Plan Timetable
d) Federal Sequester – Impact
e) Regional Industry Cluster of Opportunity - Solicitation for Proposal 2013/14, Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Richard Rubin suggested members look at the document he handed out on immigration and immigration reform. Mr. Rubin stated there will be an immigration reform bill and recommended the State Board give thought to the 3 million undocumented immigrants in California that will require jobs. Mr. Rubin stated we need to take seriously the fact that we will have to accommodate this influx of individuals. He also stated the IPC will include this topic on their agenda at a later meeting. Mr. Rubin mentioned that Mr. Levy, Mr. Brauer, Mr. Camp and other members are already thinking about how we are going to implement

immigration reform in California and cited page 220 of the Los Angeles City report related to the large percentage of Hispanic population.

Having no other business, Mr. Rossi adjourned the meeting at 12:50PM.

Action Requested
The California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) is asked to approve the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) policy criteria outlined below.

Background

In January 2013, the State Board's Issues and Policy Committee formed the ETPL ad hoc subcommittee. Its membership included representatives from a broad list of stakeholders (ad hoc member roster is included). The subcommittee was tasked with addressing the following items:

a) Identify the minimum performance standards for private postsecondary education training providers to be included on the ETPL. Local boards can develop more stringent local performance requirements for their training providers approved locally,

b) Develop administrative processes to ensure the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) and its reporting system is leveraged and that ETPL providers adhere to BPPE requirements,

c) Determine minimum performance standards for the Department of Industrial Relations' Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS) registered apprenticeship programs and the administrative process for their inclusion on the ETPL,

d) Establish procedures to ensure the ongoing management of the ETPL and that training providers maintain performance standards, and

e) Ensure the role and responsibilities of local boards outlined in WIA are maintained.

The subcommittee met twice and provided input on draft documents developed by staff. The resulting policy revision addresses all the issues outlined above. This policy establishes statewide minimum performance standards for all three categories below and specifies that training programs must be in priority industry sectors that have been identified either through the local planning process or the state economic analysis. All ETPL programs to be subject to an annual performance review to ensure only quality training programs are included and remain listed on the ETPL. Specifically, the policy revision requires:

Policy Criteria

Private Postsecondary Training Programs: Must meet and maintain a 70% placement rate for all eligible graduates in that program. Training must be for occupations in priority sectors identified in the State plan and/or local area plans. Training must result in completion/receipt of an industry recognized credential, certificate, or degree, including all industry appropriate licensing and/or certification requirements.

Definition of Placement Rate for BPPE Approved Programs: Placement is measured six months from the graduation date of each student, and reports all students in the program compared to those who have gained employment in the field of study. This calculation excludes students who meet specific exclusion criteria (e.g. death, incarceration, active military duty, continued education beyond graduation, etc.)

California Community College Programs: Must achieve and maintain a 70% certificate or credential attainment rate overall and a 70% Placement Rate in training-related employment for WIA enrolled students in that program. Training must be for occupations in priority sectors identified in the State plan and/or local area plans. Training must result in completion/receipt of an industry recognized credential, certificate, or degree, including all industry appropriate licensing and/or certification requirements.

This category of program will not be subject to the initial performance standards as data to evaluate performance is not currently collected. However, the performance criteria will be applied to these programs in subsequent years.

DAS Registered Apprenticeship Program: Maintain a 70% Apprenticeship Completion rate.

Definition of Completion Rate for DAS Programs: State-registered apprenticeship programs, which have had at least two (2) graduating classes, which have had an annual apprentice completion rate of at least 70% of the average completion rate for two (2) consecutive years for the applicable trade or occupation as verified by the State Division of Apprenticeship Standards.

Implications

a) The policy ensures the state requirements for training providers, subject to registration and approval to operate by BPPE, are properly vetted and comply with BPPE's annual performance reporting requirements.

b) The policy provides a documented method to review performance, for both the initial determination and an annual performance assessment, to list and retain only those programs that meet and maintain the state's minimum level of performance.

c) The policy implements administrative solutions to list programs offered by the campuses of the California Community College system as well as apprenticeship programs registered with DAS.

d) Some providers, with history of providing training services to WIA clients may not have registered or have not received approval to operate by BPPE. This could result in some providers that provide quality training programs being removed from the list, pending their approval by BPPE. The policy includes a transition period to January 1, 2014 to ensure all providers listed on the ETPL are properly registered and approved to operate by BPPE.

e) The list will be reviewed annually by the state and local boards. The timelines associated with this performance review are outlined in Steps b-h below. If programs do not meet the performance standards, the local board will notify them of their removal from the ETPL. The State Board will also remove training programs if they have not complied with BPPE's annual report card requirement. The policy also includes detailed instructions regarding notification and appeal procedures.

Timeline

a) September 2013
DRAFT Policy Directive is published for 30-day public comment period.
Training Providers are required to submit their Annual Report of Performance to BPPE.

b) December 2013
The Employment Development Department (EDD) provides lists of providers by local area to local boards for review and subsequent eligibility determination.

c) February 2014
Local boards complete the local review of training providers and subsequent eligibility determination and forward the list to EDD.

d) March/April 2014
Local boards notify the providers that have been delisted and provide information on appeal procedures.

EDD shall verify with BPPE that reporting requirements have been satisfied, retain all providers that meet the performance criteria, and delist all providers that do not meet the performance requirements.

e) May 2014
EDD shall notify the providers that have been removed from the ETPL due to noncompliance with BPPE reporting requirements and provide information on the appeal process. EDD will also notify local boards of training providers that have been removed from the ETPL to ensure that referrals are no longer made to that program.

f) June 2014
EDD will update the ETPL and republish the list.

g) October 2014
Staff will complete and submit a report to the Issues and Policy Committee and the State Board on the policy implementation and outcomes.

Next Steps

A draft policy directive will be issued in September 2013 for a 30-day public comment period. The final policy will be issued in October 2013.

Feedback on implementation issues -- including evaluation of performance, annual review, and criteria for developing local ETPL policies -- will be integrated into directives and guidance.

Eligible Training Provider List Ad Hoc Committee Member Roster

NAME	TITLE ORGANIZATION/AFFILITATION
John Brauer	Executive Director of Workforce and Economic Development, California Federation of Labor
Kris Stadelman	Executive Director, North Valley Job Training Consortium (NOVA)
Alma Perez	Vice President of Education & Workforce Development, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
Joanne Wenzel	Deputy Bureau Chief, Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education
Stewart Knox	Executive Director, San Mateo County Workforce Investment Board
Patricia Rey	System Analyst, Employment Development Department
Robin Purdy	Exec Director, Sacramento Employment and Training Agency
Blake Konczal	Executive Director, Fresno Regional Workforce Investment Board
Jan Vogel	Executive Director, South Bay Workforce Investment Board
Felicia Flournoy	Exec Director, Riverside Workforce Investment Board
Diane Ravnik	Director Division of Apprenticeship Standards
Jeremy Smith	Deputy Legislative Director State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Cris McCullough	California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Carol Padovan	Federal Project Officer, US Department of Labor, Region 6, San Francisco

#

Action Requested

The California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) is asked to approve the additional performance measure policy criteria for Local Workforce Investment Boards (Local Boards) and their service providers. These measures will be used to evaluate future High-Performing Local Board designation.

Background

On May 8, 2013, the State Board, through the work of an ad hoc subcommittee of the Issues and Policy Committee, approved seven "additional" performance measures for use in evaluating customer and system progress. These measures complement and further define the WIA common measures that are standard for the California system (these include job placement, job retention, and income increases for adult and dislocated workers, and placement in employment or education, skills increases, and certificate or degree attainment for youth). In selecting these measures, it was the State Board's intention to create measurements that are directly tied to the goals of the State and local strategic plans, and tailored to reflect meaningful outcomes for jobseekers, workers, and employers.

Guiding principles for these measures- They should be:

- Easily explainable to a lay audience
- Applicable to different geographical and institutional areas of interest
- Create a level playing field among programs and service strategies
- Promote behaviors that lead to the desired outcomes
- Result in sustainable practices and efficient use of resources without compromising quality
- Methodologically sound
- Difficult to game or manipulate

The State Board requested that staff further define measurements, timeline for implementation, and implications. *See attached Policy Criteria.*

Implications and Timeline

Between August 2013 and January 1, 2014, State Board staff will work with Local Board directors, staff, and members to further define measurements (including ***what*** is counted, ***when*** in a service delivery cycle information is captured, and ***how*** progress is measured), the process for implementation, and individual benchmarking pilot efforts. This process will result in formal guidance and direction on how data is to be reported and evaluated. In order to

#
ensure that staff at local One Stops and training providers as well as the Employment Development Department performance management unit have adequate training, and that technical issues, definitions, and/or other aspects of the new measures can be adjusted or addressed, a pilot period to test the infrastructure for capturing and reporting data will be developed. The scope and scale of the pilot period will be determined in coordination with the Employment Development Department and Local Boards.

What will we count?

Baseline for each of the performance measures will be established both State-wide (collective goals), and for individual Local Boards (similar to the process used for the WIA Common Measures). A minimum threshold for performance will be established, and performance goals for each Local Board will be negotiated on an annual basis. These will reflect a numeric or percentage increase, and be evaluated based on progress toward goal.

How will we use this data?

These performance measures will be a criteria used to determine High-Performing Local Board designation beginning in FY 2015/16. In order to be considered for High-Performing status, Local Boards will need to meet or exceed performance goals in the majority of the measures.

Next Steps

State Board staff will work with Local Boards, the Employment Development Department, and other stakeholders to develop a timeline and process for piloting, benchmarking and implementing the measures and address technical and programmatic implications, data validity concerns, and build workforce system capacity to capture and report data.

Policy Criteria – WIA Additional Performance Measures

What is the Policy Goal?	How Will Success Be Measured?	How is the Measure Defined?	What Are the Details?
Increase the number of Californians with the skills necessary to compete in today's economy.	Attainment of Industry-Valued Credentials	Certificates and credentials that enable students to enter middle skill jobs or career pathways. *Credentials/certificates recognized by employers, trade associations, and licensing entities as meeting occupational requirements and used in hiring decisions.*	"Industry –Valued" are those certificates, degrees, or credentials (C/D/C) that are necessary to: • Enter into an occupation, without which the job seeker would not be allowed to practice or is at a disadvantage in the application process. • Enter into an occupation at a substantially higher wage rate than applicants w/o the C/D/C. • Advance in an occupation or along a career path, as evidenced by wage gain or job advancement (e.g. title change, scope of work change).
Increase the number of Californians who earn enough to make ends meet.	Placement in Quality Jobs (living wage jobs)	Jobs that meet a minimum threshold for wage and/or benefits. *A living wage is a wage that is high enough to maintain a decent standard of living (adequate food, shelter, and other necessities). Living wage varies based on the area-specific cost of living.*	Quality jobs are those that meet or exceed the Self Sufficiency Standard or Lower Living Standard Income Level for a single adult for the county in which the job is located. This will be measured by the hourly wage at placement.
Increase the number of Californians with jobs and careers in high-demand, priority industries in the regional or State economy.	Placement in Targeted Industry Sectors	Occupations in priority industry sectors as identified by the State Board or local WIBs. *Sectors may be high-demand (new jobs or replacement job openings), high-wage, or represent a critical or emerging role in the State/local economy.*	Defined as placement of an unemployed job seeker in a job in the priority industry, transition of an employed worker (in a different industry) to a job in priority industry sector, or advancement of current industry worker into new occupation in the same priority industry sector.

Policy Criteria – WIA Additional Performance Measures

What is the Policy Goal?	How Will Success Be Measured?	How is the Measure Defined?	What Are the Details?
Increase the income of Californians who participate in workforce services and/or training.	Return on Investment	Expenditures for workforce services as compared against outcomes achieved.	Defined as income increase for workers placed in a new job or advanced to a new occupation as a result of services delivered through the local WIB. Return on Investment will be measured by the ratio between workforce service cost as compared to income change.
Increase the value of the workforce system to businesses/employers.	Employer Engagement & Employer Investment	Employers are active partners in and customers of workforce services, and provide meaningful contributions – financial and in-kind- to programs.	Measurement of the: • Percentage of employers who are repeat customers of the local workforce system, and/or • Increase in the dollar value or percentage of total budget from employer contribution to training, internships, equipment, or other services.
Increase the responsiveness of the workforce system to local, regional, and State-wide economic conditions.	Industry Sector Partnerships	Collaboration among workforce system providers, educational and training institutions, labor, and employers that target the supply and demand gaps (hiring, training, productivity, diversity, etc.) in targeted industries.	Increase in the number and /or strength of industry sector partnerships, as measured by: • Number or percentage of workers hired from sector programs. • Number or percentage of credentials achieved for sector program graduates. • Improvement in sector employer/industry outcomes (increased productivity, decrease time to hire, etc.)
Increase the impact of the workforce system and limit duplication of services.	Alignment of Funding Streams	Local and/or regional funding decisions are reflective of workforce system goals.	Funding that is dedicated to workforce system performance and outcome measures defined in the local WIB plan (including those listed here), as measured by the percentage of total LWIB budget.

Performance Ad Hoc Committee Member Roster

NAME	TITLE ORGANIZATION/AFFILITATION
Alma Perez, Ad Hoc Chair	Vice President of Education & Workforce Development, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
Joseph Williams	CEO, Youth Action Project
Abby Snay	Executive Director, Jewish Vocational Services
John Brauer	Executive Director of Workforce and Economic Development, California Federation of Labor
Nathan Nayman	State and Local Relations, Visa Inc.
Stewart Knox	Executive Director, San Mateo County Workforce Investment Board
Patricia Rey	System Analyst, Employment Development Department
Robin Purdy	Executive Director, Sacramento Employment and Training Agency
Nick Schultz	Director, Alameda County Workforce Investment Board
Felicia Flournoy	Executive Director, Riverside Workforce Investment Board
Stephen Baiter	Director, Contra Costa County Workforce Investment Board
Jeremy Smith	Deputy Legislative Director State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Cris McCullough	California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Pam Harris	Director, Employment Development Department
Carol Padovan	Federal Project Officer, US Department of Labor, Region 6, San Francisco