

**Increased Skills & Credential Attainment Work Group**  
**December 18, 2014**  
**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**  
**Meeting Summary**

**Workgroup members in attendance:**

Stephen Baiter <i>Contra Costa County WIB</i>	John Brauer <i>California Labor Federation</i>	John Dunn <i>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office</i>
Imran Farooq <i>Omnium Group LLC</i>	Michael Gallo, Chair <i>Kelly Space &amp; Technology</i>	Colleen Moore <i>Sacramento State University</i>
Kimberly Parker, Co-Chair <i>California Employers Association</i>	Kish Rajan <i>GoBiz</i>	Diane Ravnik <i>Division of Apprenticeship Standards</i>
Bob Redlo <i>Doctor's Medical Center</i>	Nicole Rice for Pamela Kan <i>Bishop-Wisecarver/CMTA</i>	Andre Schoorl <i>Labor Workforce Development Agency</i>
Russ Weikle <i>California Department of Education</i>		

**I. Introduction and Welcome**

Mike Gallo opened the meeting and welcomed Mr. Mike Rossi on the phone. Mr. Rossi thanked the work group for taking on the challenge of focusing on what is best for CA in getting trained for jobs and working as a team moving forward. Focus has to be on jobs and demand needs of business, get them involved, measurement of success = how many people get real, sustainable jobs. The Governor is focused on the issue, integrated, breaking down silos, and ROI in getting real employment moving particularly in areas where it has been stagnant.

**II. Group discussion based on paper: General Landscape of Credentials in California and Developing Priorities for Large Scale Change**

Ms. Parker walked the work group through the draft paper provided to the work group after introducing a short video from the National Skills Coalition seen here: [Video Link](#) The video captured the problems we are facing, but getting to the solution will be difficult.

- Are there a couple of issues we can focus on to make a difference?
- The more we can engage employers, the closer we will be towards goal. We need the ability to measure progress and objectively assess. Employer investment will need some way to measure.

- May need Governor's mandate to have agencies work together.
- Not a supply problem – there is a lot of training and credentials out there. The question is does it have value in the market? How can we calibrate supply and demand so employers have a way to communicate to training providers and inform curriculum. Which credentials have value? Regional level work needs to be done to get calibration.
- What are the common criteria for credentials that are being used? How do we move away from those that don't have value and focus on enhancing and expanding the use of those that do?
- We need to do some market building to work with employers to see what they need and make them aware of what is out there. Cultural differences between business and education will need to be addressed with a bridge, incentives to support collaboration.
- Evaluation of any credential should include experience; be competency based.
- Industry values credentials but in California employers are not familiar with them. A level education to employers will be critical so they can see the value.
- We need to do some work on the credentials themselves before we educate employers about them. Employers need to be brought in to help establish what is valued. The public also needs assurances that an individual has a credential to do the job.
- Need consider regional needs of employers. Employers may not recognize a credential from another part of the country but when that credential is broken down, they do see value of its components. Could we look at core skills in credentials and customize them regionally?
- Some may argue that there really is not a skills gap because if there were, there would be upward pressure on wages to recruit workers. Information Communication Technology (ICT) sector may fit that criteria. When they have trouble finding workers, they put money in to bring the right people on board. This sector is organized tightly around *skills* rather than credentials.
- Making the case that each industry we take on may need to be addressed differently. What is our scale and scope to make an impact? May not be an issue of supply and demand not matching up. What is the capacity for us to move the needle and fill pipelines at targeted industries? There may not be skills gaps in certain industries.
- Has a census been done within CA to know what credentials are important? What is supply & demand issue in various sectors?
- We have a year to do something – need to narrow work and target a few industry sectors and a few occupations within it. We need to prioritize and focus – engage with sector employers to find out what they need.
- We should not get stuck on “credentials” - they are just a tool. We need to find out what the continuum of skills that is necessary, how do they differ from sector to sector, occupation to occupation, and how do we craft system or standards that can be tailored and not be static?

- Simplify definition of credential. What are the quality elements/criteria that can be uniformly endorsed? What are the elements of what a quality credential is (regardless of what kind of credential)
- Need to go to those large sector associations and find out what they need.
- Maybe look at Healthcare for its established credentialing and maybe ICT as something new and more dynamic.
- CCCCCO Sector Navigators are doing some of this work and can help.
- Consistency across colleges is important.
- In education in general, local autonomy/control, own curriculum, faculty in charge – works against business perspective for uniform curriculum. There is no off-the-shelf standardized curriculum in CA. There is no mechanism for educators to know what employers need across the state. Anywhere there are industry standard certifications, we need to push programs to align with them.
- Need to use existing resources to channel the education system the right way – message from the top to standardize their programs. Stop the programs that don't meet the standardized curriculum. We don't have the authority to tell the colleges that, has to be mandated.
- Inability for education system to have employer engagement in advisory committees in order to drive the change. Also no way to engage across districts.
- Courses should be taught with ability to offer the certification that goes with it.
- Need to take natl programs and ask CCC (and other training entities) to adopt – but still have to help instruct employers as to why they should care about that.
- Is there a way to find out what they need and capture it. Job seekers can use this see what skills they need for a certain job. Training providers make that training available based on employer needs. CalJOBS can do this but missing the employer component. John Dunn mentioned Launchpath.

### III. Discussion Item: Creating a 12-month Plan

What are the proposed activities for implementation plan and bringing to scale? We need a project plan of tasks and activities prioritized within 12-month plan. If we want to do the work well, we need to prioritize industries to focus on – those that may have skills gaps. Healthcare, Manufacturing, ICT are all very different in where they are in certifications. We can use SlingShot coalitions to look at these regionally.

We should also give consideration of various constituencies on the supply side – vets, out of school youth, etc. Follow up with partners that work with these constituencies to identify those groups.

The remainder of this discussion was captured on flip charts notes (attached).

Clarity on what this group is going to do to increase the number of industry valued credentials. Which have value? What are the levers do we have to push training providers

to do what matters. What can we change and use levers to make that change. Need to distil what we can take on.

Mr. Rossi: If we had clarity right now, we would fail. Find out what has worked and build on that. No one in this group should be concerned with clarity at this point.

What is the intersection of this work group with the WIOA implementation work group? This work is very relevant to WIOA implementation, looking at this information will be useful moving forward. Our interpretation of a deliverable will have statewide impact (not just regional demonstrations). We will begin by “thinking small” and build big.

#### **IV. Discussion Item: Next Steps/Next Meeting**

Staff will capture this conversation and begin to put together an action plan, engaging members in between meetings.

#### **V. Public Comment**

Brian McMahon: Process for implementing WIOA is moving quickly with 12 months to develop combined plan. This group’s work will inform key aspects of that plan. Developing work plan, staying engaged, having a clear agenda with tangible outcomes is all great.

Nick Loret de Mola: Get this information from this meeting to SlingShot facilitators. Influence WIOA through career pathways maps. Reporting training outcomes could be something concrete to take charge of.

#### **Meeting Adjourned**