



**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICIES COMMITTEE
Meeting Notice**



**Tuesday, November 13, 2012
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

**Sacramento Training and Employment Agency (SETA)
Board Room
925 Del Paso Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 263-3800**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

The meeting will be accessible through a teleconference webinar; please see details below.

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. Action Items:**
 - a) Approve Branding and web-based Portal Activities Timeline
- 3. Discussion:**
 - a) State Plan: Public Comment and Plan Revisions
 - b) High Performing Board Certification and Local Strategic Planning Guidance for Program Years 2013-2017
 - c) Integrated Services Delivery Evaluation Recommendations
 - d) Identification of Additional Performance Measures
 - e) State Board Policy for the Eligible Training Provider List.
 - f) Identify and Prioritize Policy and Legislative Issues
 - g) Committee Mission Statement
 - h) Meeting Calendar
- 4. Updates:**
 - a) WIA Standard Record Data Reporting
- 5. Other Business**
- 6. Public Comment**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.cwib.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.



**CALIFORNIA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD
ISSUES AND POLICIES COMMITTEE
Meeting Notice**



**Tuesday, November 13, 2012
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

**Sacramento Training and Employment Agency (SETA)
Board Room
925 Del Paso Blvd
Sacramento, CA 95815
(916) 263-3800**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

MEETING INFORMATION

Topic: Issues and Policies Committee

Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2012

Time: 9:30 am, Pacific Standard Time (San Francisco, GMT-08:00)

Meeting Number: 747 345 718

Meeting Password: cwib777

To join the online meeting

1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=193512552&UID=1334376137&PW=NMjhiMGlyYjRk&RT=MIM0>

Teleconference Information

Call-in number (Verizon): 1-866-748-2780 (US)

Attendee access code: 613 254 1

For assistance

- 1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/mc>
2. On the left navigation bar, click "Support".

To add this meeting to your calendar program (for example Microsoft Outlook), click this link:

<https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=193512552&UID=1334376137&ICS=MI&LD=1&RD=2&ST=1&SHA2=8jmxOiMUShBVrdhWzAOBLyAhu8x6aj-PGIQoLWJTFw=&RT=MIM0>

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.cwib.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.

Item 1: Welcome and Opening Remarks

Item 2: Action Items:

a) Approve Branding and web-based Portal Activities Timeline

America's Job Center of California Network Brand Implementation Plan

Due Date	Activity	Responsible Party	Comments
November 1, 2012	Establish a logo to represent the California One-Stop System	EDD and CWIB	
	Develop a style guide to address the use of logo, slogan, co-branding parameters, etc.	EDD	
	Develop a letterhead template	EDD	
	Identify the CWIB/AJCC brand manager(s)	CWIB	
December 1, 2012	One-Stop search and mapping	CWIB	
	Establish criteria for content to be posted on portal	CWIB and EDD	
	Develop a form/template for partners to submit updates, stories, and changes to the AJCC website.	EDD	
	Establish the one-stop certification policy.	CWIB	
	Design official America's Job Center of California decal.	EDD	
	Identify a local brand manager for each of the 49 LWIAs.	CWIB and LWIAs	
January 1, 2013	Define what is required to be a certified One-Stop Center and the service expectations of each.	CWIB	
	Produce decals	EDD	
	Announcement to all LWIAs and respective One-Stop partners regarding the branding implementation plan.	CWIB	
	Clarify responsibilities for management of portal (publishing, eliminating duplication, day to day administration/up keep)	CWIB and EDD	
February 1, 2013	Collect success stories to be featured on portal.	CWIB	
March 1, 2013	Identify an effective means of communicating to our business partners the services and benefits to employers	CWIB and EDD	
	Develop a list of employer specific benefits.	CWIB	
April 1, 2013	All partner message giving status on implementation efforts.	CWIB/EDD	
	AJCC portal on test for review.	EDD	
May 1, 2013	Produce a video introducing the AJCC system.	EDD in consult with the CWIB staff	
	Inform government partners of branding effort	CWIB	
	Inform elected officials of branding effort.	CWIB	
	Official reminder to all One-Stop partners of minimum criteria to be a member of the network, deadlines to submit information to the portal, etc.	CWIB	
June 1, 2013	All One-Stop centers are in compliance with branding standards.	All CWIB to verify	
	Distribute AJCC branding package to all One-Stops	EDD	
July 1, 2013	Launch of America's Job Center of California network.	All	
	Outreach campaign to job seekers and employers	EDD and CWIB	

America's Job Center of California (AJCC) Brand Implementation Two Year Plan

Phase 1: July 2013 Launch

- Phase 1 focuses on the introduction of the America's Job Center of California brand.
- Allows for co-branding at the local level.

Strategies

- Identify a local brand manager for each of the 49 LWIAs. This individual will represent their area and participate in quarterly meetings. Participants may also be asked to participate more frequently as needed in conference calls and/or meetings with the CWIB/AJCC brand managers.
- Establish a website portal to introduce the America's Job Center of California system. This portal/website will be owned by the California Workforce Investment Board and maintained by the Employment Development Department. It will serve as the connection between job seekers, employers, and training providers to. The portal will allow users to:
 1. Learn about AJCC services (introduce and define).
 2. Local AJCC centers and affiliated partners.
 3. California's job exchange system (the New CalJOBSSM).
 4. AJCC success stories.
 5. Labor market information.
 6. Career counseling services.
 7. Training opportunities.
 8. Job placement services for both job seekers and employers.

All AJCCs and affiliated partners are able to contribute items to be featured on the portal. The site will contain links to each AJCC and affiliate service centers' local websites and each local website is to feature a reciprocal link to the portal. Only certified AJCCs and affiliates will be featured on this site.

Contributions to the site can be made by the appointed LWIA brand representatives via the CWIB/AJCC brand managers. Contributions include: success stories, grant announcements, event announcements, targeted job recruitments, etc.

- Develop and Implement a collaborative outreach campaign to introduce new name and establish service expectations. In concert with CWIB, EDD, and LWIA brand managers.
- Identify a deadline for all One-Stops to comply with requirements of Phase 1.

- Require all One-Stops to include “Proud partner of America’s Job Center of California network” or “America’s Job Center of California” with their current name in the following:
 1. Collateral
 2. Letterhead (Develop a Word template that allows placement of the local logo, and includes the America’s Job Center of California logo.
 3. All public communication vehicles and tools (statements, press releases, brochures, advertisements, reports, products, web pages, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with WIA funds.)
 4. Signage (a decal displayed on the windows and doors of the offices reflecting “A member of America’s Job Center of California”)

- Provide electronic files of logo that include usage guidelines to be used as needed in the development of materials as mentioned above.
- Create and distribute informational pieces statewide that describe the AJCC system, service expectations, and information on how to access these services.
- Provide the option to incorporate local logo.
 1. Electronic files provided to allow locals to print on an office printer
 2. Camera/print press ready files to allow locals to use their current printing processes and resources.
- Identify the entity/authority to create tools, style guide, and train AJCC partners on appropriate usage.
- Identify the authority to monitor compliance activity amongst one-stops. It is proposed that EDD compliance monitors incorporate the branding requirements into their current review process.
- The EDD Workforce Services Branch will communicate policy and operational requirements to all One-Stop operations regarding the use of the brand.

Phase 2: July 2014

- Focus is the Network and One-Stop system.
- All co-branding is to be eliminated.
- Objective is one name to be adopted by the entire system by year’s end.

Strategies

- Require all full-service One-stops to be called America’s Job Center of California.
- All single-service providers shall remain “A proud partner of America’s Job Center of California.”

- *America’s Job Center of California* is to be reflected on:
 - Signage
 - Letterhead
 - Collateral
 - All other communication vehicles, as stated in Phase 1.

Implementation Steps

- Define what a certified One-Stop center is and the service expectations of each.
- Identify the CWIB/AJCC Brand manager.
- Identify local brand manager for each of the 49 LWIAs.
- Establish deadline requirements in phases 1 and 2.
- Establish a logo/emblem that fully represents the California One-Stop System.
- Develop a style guide to address use of logo (placement, size, restrictions of use), slogan, color, co-branding parameters, etc.
- Develop a letterhead template.
- Clarify responsibilities and establish a process for managing the portal.
- Develop a form/template to submit changes and updates for the AJCC website.
- Establish criteria for content to be posted on portal.
- Design and produce official window decal for certified One-Stop offices.
- Produce and distribute a video introducing the One-Stop system as the AJCC.
- Inform stakeholders of branding effort and the service expectations.
- Create and distribute an AJCC “Get Started” Branding Packet that includes the following:
 - Welcome and description of the AJCC brand, portal, and expectations.
 - Organizational Identity and Style Guide
 - Window decals.
 - AJCC brochures.
 - A CD with electronic files of AJCC logo and templates (letterhead, brochures, etc.).

Assumptions

1. EDD will create initial AJCC collateral and tools.
2. In collaboration with the CWIB, EDD will produce a YouTube video to introduce the AJCC brand and system.
3. EDD will monitor compliance to the brand through the current monitoring process (EDD PACB).
4. EDD will pay for implementation materials including decals, Style Guide copies, and “Get Started” packets. Estimated cost: \$500-\$1000
5. Under the direction of the CWIB, EDD will maintain the AJCC portal.
6. If an AJCC member falls out of compliance they will be removed from the portal and certifications could be jeopardized.
7. All AJCC members have a website and content is current, or can provide an alternative means of access or contact via the website.

Item 3a:

The entire State Plan has been released for public review and comment. It is recommended that the Issues and Policies Committee establish a process for reviewing the public comments regarding the State Plan. Ideally, the Committee would make suggestions for changes to the State Plan based on the public comment and present their suggestion to the full State Board for consideration during its February, 2013 meeting.

Item 3b

The High Performing Board Certification and Local Strategic Planning Guidance for Program Years 2013-2017 has been included in the State Plan, which was released for public comment on November 1, 2012. Prior to final planning guidance documents being released for implementation the Committee should review these documents and provide feedback on their effectiveness in achieving the new standards and relaying required certification criteria to the local workforce investment boards.

Item 3c

In November 2011, the final report for the Integrated Services Delivery Evaluation was presented to the State Board. The report makes several strategic recommendations. The Executive Summary and an evaluation of each recommendation are provided for the Committee's deliberation and action. The full report can be found on the State Board website at http://www.cwib.ca.gov/resources_reports.htm

Item 3d

There is general consensus among workforce system champions that using the DOL Common Measures as the sole means of measuring the overall success of the system is inadequate. It is recommended that the Committee have a discussion regarding the current performance measures, their ability to accurately reflect local success, evaluate what other data or information can be consistently gathered across local systems that reflects the broader efforts of local workforce boards, identify other fields in the WIA automated reporting system that reflect key outcomes identified in state and local plans. Also, a determination should be made by the Committee as to whether a subcommittee should be created to address these issues and present recommendations to the board during a future meeting.

Item 3e

In a report issued by the Department of Labor regarding their biennial monitoring visit of California's WIA program, it was determined the current policy does not ensure that the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) is available to all

customers. Additionally, performance information for initial eligibility is missing from some training providers. Currently, there is an administration initiative to list approved apprenticeship training programs on the ETPL. It is recommended that the Committee discuss this finding and consider identifying a minimum performance threshold for training providers to be placed on the ETPL and continue to be listed beyond the initial year of eligibility. The Committee may also consider forming a subcommittee to work on this issue and present its recommendations in a future meeting.

Item 3f

The Committee will engage in a discussion to identify policy and legislative priorities and develop a work plan.

Item 3g

When the Issues and Policy Committee was formed, the previous membership adopted a Mission Statement. It is recommended that the Committee review the statement, and modify it as necessary.

Item 3h

To ensure that the Committee has sufficient time and notice to complete its work for the Executive and State Board's review and approval, it is recommended that the Committee establish a meeting calendar for the next 6 months.

I. Interim High-Performance Local Board Standards and Evaluation Criteria

Purpose

On behalf of the Governor, the State Board must concurrently perform three statutorily required activities related to ensuring effective Local Boards. These activities are:

- 1. Approve 5-year Local Plans based on adherence to the *State Strategic Workforce Development Plan*:** Local Boards are required by federal law to submit to the State Board a comprehensive 5-year Local Plan that reflects the vision, strategy, and goals of the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan.
- 2. Recommend Local Board recertification to the Governor:** Federal and state law require the State Board to recommend to the Governor recertification of each Local Board every 2 years. Consideration is based on meeting minimum federal performance measures and compliance with state and federal law and regulations.
- 3. Evaluate Local Board performance for biennial “high-performance” certification:** Last year, Governor Brown signed SB 698 [UI Code 14200(c)] which set the bar higher for Local Board performance. By January 1, 2013, the State Board must implement standards for certifying high-performance Local Boards. The first certification must occur on or before July 1, 2013.

In order to maximize efficiency and minimize the administrative workload of the Local Boards and state staff, the State Board is combining the three above activities into a single evaluation process.

The high-performance Local Board standards will serve as the core for state guidance to Local Boards for developing their Local Plans. Those Local Boards that comply with the minimum requirements of this guidance will be considered for Local Plan approval as well as Local Board recertification. Those Local Boards that exceed the minimum requirements promulgated in the high-performance standards will be considered for status as a “high-performance” Local Board.

Those Local Boards that do not meet the minimum requirements will receive further technical assistance from the State Board and EDD-WSB to correct shortfalls. The goal is that all Local Boards receive Local Plan approval and full Local Board recertification. Additionally, those Local Boards that do not meet the high-performance standards, but wish to do so, will receive further technical assistance from EDD-WSB and the State Board.

High-performance certification is a voluntary process. A Local Board must request high-performance certification at the time its Local Plan is submitted to the State Board. It is expected that this certification will provide a Local Board increased recognition, credibility and visibility for its work.

The initial 2013 high-performance certification will primarily be based on the Local Board's commitment in the Local Plan to the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan goals and strategies. In 2015, the State Board will revise the high-performance standards and evaluation criteria to place more emphasis on measurable data related to specific employment and education outcomes for workers and job-seekers.

Assumptions

The high-performance Local Board standards and evaluation criteria are intended to:

- **Be meaningful** – They should be credible to all stakeholders and defensible in their correlation to whether a Local Board is “high-performance” or not.
- **Incentivize the implementation of the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan goals and objectives** – The standards should encourage Local Boards to:
 - Take on strategic community leadership roles that engage diverse partners and stakeholders;
 - Prioritize and invest in worker training;
 - Adopt and use sector partnerships as a key part of service delivery;
 - Publicize workforce successes; and
 - Continuously improve service delivery.
- **Be achievable and replicable** -- The standards should be a “fair game” that strong Local Boards can pass with realistic metrics. These standards should help identify Local Boards that are “high-performance”, and should neither be set so low that all variants of practice pass, nor so high that no one can pass.
- **Be easily understood** – The standards should be clear and easily understood and not result in additional administrative burden.

Scoring

Local Boards will be assessed against 5 standards. These standards coincide with the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and each of its 4 goals. Each standard contains 4 criteria for a total of 20. Four of the 20 criteria are required elements contained in WIA and state law and will be scored as pass/fail. The other 16 criteria will be worth 2 points each for a maximum of 32 possible points.

For Local Board recertification, Local Boards that fail any of the 4 required elements and/or fail to meet the minimum requirements for each of the 16 other criteria will receive a “conditional” certification and will be required to submit a corrective action plan the State Board that addresses those areas that did not meet the minimum requirements. Local Boards that pass the 4 required elements and meet the minimum requirements for each of the 16 other criteria will receive full certification.

Local Boards that seek to be considered for “high-performance” certification must pass the 4 required elements, and meet or exceed the minimum requirements for each of the 16 other criteria and obtain 26 of 32 possible points.

Scoring Definitions

0 Points:

The Local Plan element contains *insufficient* detail and *does not* meet minimum requirements.

1 Point:

The Local Plan element contains the required analysis, identifies goals and strategies for achieving the desired outcomes in sufficient detail to meet minimum requirements.

2 Points:

The Local Plan element contains detailed analysis and clearly identified goals and strategies for achieving the desired outcomes and *exceeds* minimum requirements. The Local Plan provides evidence that a regional partnership is being or has been formed (that includes education, business, labor, and other workforce entities) that support the goals and the strategies in the Local Plan. The Local Plan leverages resources of the partnership. Local elected officials were actively engaged in the planning process and participate as champions for the workforce system.

Tips for Local Boards requesting “high-performance” certification as part of their Local Plan submission

- **Focus on the standards and the criterions.** Review of the Local Plan will center on the Local Board’s demonstrated performance against each standard, and the four criteria that are being used to operationalize the standard.
- **Treat the detail under each criterion as examples, not the only required points of response.** The State Board recognizes that different Local Boards bring different strengths and approaches to these expectations. Use whatever combination of the topics included as examples of proof with others that are locally relevant to make your case.
- **Be clear and concise.** Applicants won’t get additional points for volume of detail provided. The State Board and the review team are interested in Local Boards telling their story succinctly.

Standards

I. Strategic Planning and Implementation

Expectation: In support of the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan, the Local Board developed and will implement an actionable strategic plan through an inclusive stakeholder process that articulates key workforce issues and prioritized strategies for impacting them, both within the LWIA, regionally, and, where applicable, the overall labor market.

Criteria:

1. The Local Plan meets the Local Planning requirements in UI Code 14200(c) (SB 698). (Mandatory, Pass/Fail)

Evidence must include:

- The Local Plan is a strategic plan, not just a WIA program plan.
- The Local Plan incorporates and reflects the Governor’s vision, goals, and policy priorities of the Strategic Workforce Development Plan.
- The Local Plan contains measurable goals that support the goals and objectives in Chapter III of the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and includes a well-specified blueprint for attaining the goals with benchmarks, timelines, and action steps that specify who will take action to meet the goals.
- The Local Plan identifies local and regional community stakeholders and includes their input.

2. The Local Plan’s vision is strategic and comprehensive. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Plan demonstrates a good understanding of the labor market and the workforce needs of the priority industry sectors in the local and regional economy derived from a detailed economic and workforce analysis.
- The goals and strategies of the Local Plan address the workforce needs of the identified priority industry sectors in the local and regional economy and include career pathway programs to provide upward mobility to unskilled and entry-level workers in these priority industry sectors.

- The Local Plan demonstrates an awareness of the various workforce, education and training services provided in the local and regional economy and their relevance to meeting the labor market needs of the priority industry sectors.
- The Local Plan articulates how the Local Board and One-Stop delivery system will make use of, and coordinate with, the various workforce, education and training service delivery organizations and systems in the local and regional economy to achieve the Local Plan goals and objectives.

3. The Local Plan's goals and objectives are evidence-based. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Plan is informed by and based upon data from a detailed economic and workforce analysis.
- Strategies chosen are based on evidence drawn from research, evaluation, and promising practices.
- The Local Plan contains clear metrics, both quantitative and qualitative, for each strategy, and the Local Board is prepared to regularly assess progress against those strategies, including a game plan for collecting and analyzing needed information.
- The Local Board regularly receives performance information to enable it to perform its oversight role of the One-Stop operations.

4. Key stakeholders are actively engaged both in the planning and implementation of the Local Plan (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence could include describing how:

- Employers from priority industry sectors in the LWIA or regional economy were actively engaged in the planning process and continue to be during implementation.
- Local elected officials were actively engaged in the planning process and participate as champions for the workforce system.
- Labor organizations were actively engaged in the planning process and continue to be during implementation.

- Education partners, including K-12, adult education, CTE, community colleges, and universities were actively involved in the planning process and continue to be during implementation.
- CBOs representing target populations of job-seekers were actively engaged in the planning process and continue to be during implementation.
- The Local Board collaborated regionally with other Local Boards who share common labor markets during the planning process and continue to do so during implementation, including aligning resources and investments in support of shared strategies and priority industry sectors.
- The Local Plan is a living document, which the Local Board and community partners modify and update as needs and economic conditions change.

II. Business Services/Partnerships/Sector Strategies.

Expectation: The Local Board partners effectively with businesses to identify and resolve skill gaps in priority industry sectors, working in particular through industry sector partnerships.

Criteria:

1. The Local Board has included in its Local Plan a Business Services Plan, which integrates local business involvement with workforce initiatives. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of content in the business services plan include:

- How the Local Board collaborates with businesses to identify skill gaps that are reducing the competitiveness of local businesses within relevant regional economies.
- How the Local Board effectively engages employers, including representatives from priority industry sectors, as members of the Local Board and in development of the Business Services Plan.
- What regional or joint approaches with other Local Boards and other partners are being undertaken to align services to employers.
- What metrics will the Local Board use to gauge the effectiveness of services provided to business.

2. The Local Board partners with priority industry sector employers and educators in developing and operating regional workforce and economic development networks as a primary strategy. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- Regional workforce and economic development networks include employers from priority industry sectors and other partners such as educators, workforce developers and others the partnership deems important. An industry-credible convener facilitates the work of each network.
- Regional workforce and economic development networks focus on identifying and meeting the skill needs of the priority industry sectors, while industry sector partnerships focus on developing career pathways that contain entry points for low-skilled workers for each cluster within a priority industry sector.
- Regional workforce and economic development networks operate at the regional geographic scale appropriate to the labor markets for the relevant priority industry sectors.

3. The Local Board facilitates and/or participates in unified workforce services support to employers within their labor market, integrating with other relevant Local Boards, educators, and other partners. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Example of evidence:

- The Local Board leads and/or partners in a unified employer services strategy or in regional workforce and economic development networks that provides businesses with single points of contact spanning all relevant agencies.

4. The Local Board takes the lead in identifying and obtaining resources to sustain operation of regional workforce and economic development networks over time. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board embeds regional workforce and economic development networks into its use of formula WIA funds and other funds it manages.
- The Local Board works with regional workforce and economic development networks to develop and implement sustainability strategies, leveraging or braiding combinations of public and private funding.

- The Local Board seeks out funding opportunities and aligns resources with labor, education, corrections, social services, economic development and other key partners and programs in support of the State Strategic Workforce Plan.

III. Investment in Training, Skills Development, and Career Pathways.

Expectation: The Local Board views as a priority the increasing of worker skills and workplace competencies and the development and use of career pathways that connect skills to good jobs that can provide economic security.

Criteria:

- 1. The Local Board ensures pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship training is coordinated with one or more apprenticeship programs approved by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards for the occupation and geographic area. (Mandatory, Pass/Fail scoring)**

Example of evidence:

- The Local Board has clearly articulated goals and strategies for fostering collaboration between community colleges and approved apprenticeship programs in the geographic area to provide pre-apprenticeship training, apprenticeship training, and continuing education in apprenticeable occupations through the approved apprenticeship, as required by the Workforce Training Act [UI Code Section 14230 (AB 554)].

- 2. The Local Board prioritizes training for occupations in priority industry sectors in the local or regional economy resulting in completion and attainment of a degree and/or other credentials valued and used by priority industry sector employers within the region. (Maximum 2 points possible)**

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board requires training funds be used to prepare workers for occupations in priority industry sectors for which demand can be articulated or projected through their detailed economic and workforce analysis.
- The Local Board engages priority industry sector employers to ascertain what degrees and credentials are of value to them.
- The Local Board has clearly defined strategies to ensure it meets the minimum expenditure levels of their Adult and Dislocated Worker WIA

formula allocations on workforce training services, as required by the Workforce Training Act [UI Code Section 14211 (SB 734)].

- The Local Board sets training completion as an ETPL eligibility requirement and performance expectation for continued eligibility of its training providers.
- The Local Board identifies high-quality training providers based on credentials attained and relevant employment outcomes for graduates.
- The Local Board sets the attainment of industry-recognized degrees, credentials or certificates in the priority industry sectors identified in its detailed economic and workforce analysis as a measurable expectation in its training investments.

3. The Local Board emphasizes career pathways as a framework through which learners can connect their skills and interests with viable career options. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board utilizes industry sector partnerships to collaborate with priority industry sector employers and local K-12 and postsecondary educators to map career pathways within and across those industries.
- The Local Board collaborates with educators, One-Stop operators and training providers to ensure learners can obtain and make effective use of career pathway information.

4. The Local Board continually partners with employers, educators, and other stakeholders to identify funding to support worker training and education that results in improved skills, degree, credential and certificate attainment, and employment. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Example of evidence:

- There is a regional workforce and economic development partnership or similar partnership with a written revenue plan, or a similar document, which describes strategies to obtain, leverage or braid resources, and includes goals and progress measures aligned to the Local Plan.

IV. Youth Strategies.

Expectation: The Local Board is a strategic leader in building partnerships to reduce high school dropout rates; to effectively re-engage disconnected youth in education and work; to help youth understand career pathway options; and to encourage attainment of post-secondary degrees and other credentials valued by industry in the local area or region's labor market.

Criteria:

1. The Local Board is a partner with K-12 education and others on strategies that reduce high school dropout rates. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board helps craft strategies that identify students at risk of dropping out and helps execute interventions to work closely with those students to keep them engaged.
- The Local Board partners in setting metrics for dropout rate reduction and in engaging employers, parents, and other stakeholders in meeting those goals.

2. The Local Board is a partner in developing and executing strategies to re-engage disconnected youth. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board partners with diverse stakeholders such as education, juvenile justice, human services, faith-based organizations, and others, to develop and deliver a comprehensive set of services designed to re-engage young people who have already dropped out of school and are at risk in education and employment attainment.
- The Local Board collaborates with those partners to fund the re-engagement of disconnected youth in education and employment.
- The Local Board works with its partners to set metrics for success rates in youth re-engagement and to make those results visible to the community.
- The Local Board has developed new and innovative strategies and partnerships, which have resulted in increased employment opportunities for youth in the local area or region.

3. The Local Board partners with employers, educators and others to help youth understand career pathway options. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board partners in developing career pathway information and tools that will work effectively with youth.
- The Local Board contextualizes its youth employment strategies within career pathways.

4. The Local Board encourages youth to focus on attainment of postsecondary degrees and other credentials important to priority industry sector employers in the local or regional labor market. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The One-Stop system is youth-friendly and provides information on jobs in priority industry sectors with career pathways leading to economic security in the local area or region; access to postsecondary education that provides credentials, certificates and degrees in priority sectors; and financial assistance and scholarship programs and opportunities.
- The Local Board publicizes information and research that shows the connections of various kinds of postsecondary credential, certificate or degree attainment with employment rates and wages.
- The Local Board informs young people about the market value of CTE, “Earn and Learn” training options such as apprenticeships, OJT, etc., and industry-valued credentials and certificates that require less time than a 2 or 4 year degree.

V. Managing the Work of the Local Board.

Expectation: The Local Board consists of a strong, engaged membership that represents the community; measures its effectiveness in meeting both federal and state legal requirements and its own local goals; has a process for continuous review and improvement of performance; and shares its results.

Criteria:

1. The Local Board membership meets all legal requirements (WIA, SB293) and is representative of the community. (Mandatory, Pass/Fail)

Evidence must include:

Shared Strategy for a Shared Prosperity

California’s Strategic Workforce Development Plan 2012 – 2017

- Membership includes a majority of business members from priority industry sectors within the local area or regional labor market.
- The Local Board membership includes at least 15 percent of members representing labor organizations and this requirement is incorporated into their bylaws.

NOTE: A Local Board with a participation level of 10-15 percent may receive a passing score *only if* there is a letter from its local labor council stating that the labor council has reached an agreement with the Local Board to that lower participation level.

2. The Local Board meets other required elements (WIA, SB698). (Mandatory, Pass\Fail)

Evidence must include:

- The Local Board has established and provided a copy of the MOUs with all the mandatory partners identified in the WIA, as well as other local partners supporting One-Stop service operations.
- The Local Board has established at least one comprehensive One-Stop in their LWIA.
- The Local Board has established a sub-committee of the Local Board that further develops and makes recommendations for the Business Service Plan to the Local Board in an effort to increase employer involvement in the activities of the Local Board and this requirement is incorporated into their bylaws.
- The Local Board has an active and engaged Youth Council.
- The Local Board has met the 30 percent expenditure requirement for out-of-school youth.
- The Local Board has an approved Corrective Action Plan for all audit findings.
- The Local Board has achieved at least 80 percent of its negotiated WIA Common Measure performance goals in the past year.

3. The Local Board continuously reviews performance of its programs and initiatives, and has a strategy for encouraging and ensuring continuous improvement. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- The Local Board uses a performance dashboard that tracks key metrics about the results from its programs and initiatives.
- The Local Board seeks and receives feedback from its customers and partners and has a strategy for responding to their identified issues and for improving customer satisfaction.
- The Local Board engages local constituencies in the analysis of community workforce information and subsequent strategic planning.
- The Local Board has a mechanism for determining return on investment.
- The Local Board works with its partners and/or other Local Boards to reduce administrative costs by streamlining paper processes, improving efficiencies, reducing duplication, etc.

4. The Local Board transparently communicates the results of its efforts with the community. (Maximum 2 points possible)

Examples of evidence:

- Local Board meeting summaries clearly articulate and demonstrate progress towards the Local Plan goals.
- The Local Board publishes and widely disseminates a performance dashboard containing program and initiative results.
- The Local Board communicates the success of its programs to employers and job seekers.

		Maximum Points	Section 117 Certification
I	Strategic planning and implementation		
1	The Plan Meets the Local Planning Requirements in SB 698	Pass\Fail	Pass
2	The Plan's Scope of Vision is Strategic and Comprehensive.	2	1
3	Key Stakeholders are Actively Engaged both in the Planning and Implementation.	2	1
4	The Plan's Goals and Strategies are Evidence-Based.	2	1
II	Business Services/Partnerships/Sector Strategies		
1	The LWIB has adopted a business services plan consistent with its Strategic Plan, that integrates local business involvement with workforce initiatives.	2	1
2	The LWIB partners with employers in key industries and educators in developing and operating industry sector partnerships as a primary strategy.	2	1
3	The LWIB facilitates and/or participates in unified workforce services support to employers within their labor market, integrating with other relevant LWIBs, educators, and other partners.	2	1
4	The LWIB leads in identifying and obtaining resources to sustain operation of industry sector partnerships over time.	2	1
III	Youth Strategies		
1	The LWIB is a partner with K-12 education and others on strategies that reduce high school dropout rates.	2	1
2	The LWIB is a partner in strategies to re-engage disconnected youth.	2	1
3	The LWIB partners with employers, educators and others to help youth understand career pathway options.	2	1
4	The LWIB encourages youth to focus on attainment of post-secondary degrees and other credentials important to employers in the LWIB's labor market.	2	1

IV Investing in training/skills development/career pathways

		Pass\Fail	Pass
1	The LWIB ensures pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship training is coordinated with one or more apprenticeship programs approved by the Division of Apprenticeship Standards for the occupation and geographic area.		
2	The LWIB prioritizes training for occupations in demand in the local economy resulting in completion and attainment of a degree and/or other credentials valued by industries within the region.	2	1
3	The LWIB emphasizes career pathways as a framework through which learners can connect their skills and interests with viable career options.	2	1
4	The LWIB partners with employers, educators, and other stakeholders continually to identify funding to support worker training and education that results in improved skills, credentials, and employment.	2	1

V Managing the work of the WIB

1	The LWIB membership meets all legal requirements and is representative of the community.	Pass\Fail	Pass
2	The LWIB meets WIA requirements.	Pass\Fail	Pass
3	The LWIB continuously reviews performance of both programs and initiatives, and has a strategy for ensuring ongoing improvement.	2	1
4	The LWIB maintains transparency in regards to all efforts within the community.	2	1

Scoring Criteria

0 = did not meet minimum requirements

1 = met minimum requirements

2 = exceeded minimum requirements

Total Maximum Points Available

	<u>32</u>
Minimum Score for WIA Section 117 Certification	16
Minimum Score for High Performing Certification	26

H. Interim Local Plan Guidance

WIA Section 118 and California UI Code Sections 14221-14222 require the Local Boards to submit a comprehensive five-year Local Plan to the State Board. The Local Plan mirrors the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and identifies the Local Board strategies to achieve the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan goals and actions. The recent amendments to the Workforce Training Act added similar local and regional strategic planning requirements in addition to the WIA Local Plan requirements [UI Code 14200(c)]. As a result, the Local Plan must now support the 4 State Strategic Workforce Development Plan goals and related objectives in addition to the WIA requirements.

In order for Local Boards to have as much time as possible to draft their Local Plan and obtain CLEO approval by the April 1, 2013 submission deadline, the State Board is providing this interim instruction and guidance for development of the five-year Local Plan. The State Board and EDD-WSB will issue a formal EDD Directive with detailed final guidance by December 2012. Local Boards are encouraged to begin their local planning as soon as possible using this interim guidance.

The State Board and EDD-WSB Regional Advisors will provide technical assistance to LWIA administrators and staff responsible for developing the Local Plan. The State Board will conduct a series of regional technical assistance forums throughout the state in fall/winter 2012/2013. The EDD-WSB Regional Advisors will assist the State Board in the review and approval of the Local Plans as well as with negotiations of Local Board performance level targets.

PROPOSED TIMELINE FOR LOCAL PLAN REVIEW, LWIB RE-CERTIFICATION and HIGH PERFORMANCE LWIB CERTIFICATION

As stated in Chapter VI, in 2013 the State Board will concurrently perform three statutorily required activities in order to maximize efficiency and minimize administrative workload of the Local Boards and state staff. These activities are:

1. Approval of new five-year Local Plans;
2. Evaluation of Local Board performance to recommend full or conditional Local Board recertification to the Governor; and
3. Evaluation of Local Board performance for “high-performance” certification.

PROPOSED TIMELINE

November 2012	State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and Interim Local Plan and high-performance criteria released for public comment.
Fall 2012 –Winter 2013	State Board, ETP and EDD-WSB Regional Advisors conduct Local Plan training and technical assistance forums throughout California.
December 2012	DOLETA approves State Strategic Workforce Development Plan and statewide WIA Common Measure performance targets.
January-March 2013	Local Boards negotiate WIA Common Measure performance targets with State Board and EDD-WSB.
April 1, 2013	Local Plans and requests for high-performance certification submitted to State Board.
April-June 2013	State review team reviews Local Plans and determines minimum and high-performance using the evaluation rubric in Appendix I.
April-June 2013	State Board and EDD-WSB notifies Local Boards of Local Plan deficiencies and provides technical assistance.
By July 1, 2013	State Board notifies CLEO of approved Local Plan, full or conditional Local Board recertification, and if requested, high-performance certification.
July 1, 2013	State Board recommends to the Governor the withholding of WIA formula funds to LWIA’s that have not submitted or do not have an approved Local Plan.

The State Strategic Workforce Development Plan promotes a regional approach to the identification of priority sectors and clusters of opportunity, the prioritization of employer needs, the coordination of resources, and the sustainability of the targeted investments. In order to minimize duplication of effort, Local Boards are encouraged to pool their resources to share the cost and workload of their strategic planning regionally.

Prior to approval, the State Board will review each Local Plan to ensure that they contain key required elements such as:

- WIA Local Plan elements required by DOLETA and UI Code Section 14221, such as:
 - Locally negotiated performance levels;
 - Updated MOUs;
 - Budget plans;
 - Participant summaries; and
- State requirements and strategies related to the Workforce Training Act (UI Code Section 14220(c)).

The following pages provide the outline and the content of the Local Plan. The outline is structured so that the Local Plan supports the four State Strategic Workforce Development Plan goals and related objectives.

SECTION 1 VISION

The Governor’s vision calls for a state strategy based on ongoing skills attainment focused on regional growth industry sectors and clusters. By braiding education, training, and employment services together to support these sectors, the workforce system can both effectively address employers’ needs for a high-quality, appropriately skilled workforce and support workers’ needs for well-paid, steady work. This strategy draws on lessons learned from the traditional apprenticeship model -- providing workers maximum employment outcomes through mobility among multiple employers within an industry sector or cluster.

Goal: Meet the workforce needs of high demand sectors of the regional economy.

- Describe the CLEO’s vision for bringing together the key players in workforce development including business and industry, economic development, education, and the workforce investment system to continuously identify the workforce challenges facing the LWIA or region and to develop innovative strategies and solutions that effectively leverage resources to address those challenges.
- Describe the Local Board’s actions in support of the following state priorities:
 - Preparing skilled workers for employment in competitive and emergent regional industry sectors; and
 - Participating in the development of regional workforce and economic development networks to address workforce education and training priorities.
- Based on the regional economic and workforce information analysis, identify the industry sectors and occupational clusters within the region that are high-growth, high-demand, and vital to the regional economy. The Local Board may want to consider:
 - Industries projected to add a substantial number of new jobs to the regional economy;

- Industries that have a significant impact and/or multiplier effect on the overall economy;
 - Industries that are being transformed by technology and innovation that require new skill sets for workers;
 - Industries that are new and emerging and are expected to grow.
- Some LWIAs began implementing ISD systems in Program Year 2008-2009. Describe the extent to which the LWIA has integrated its service delivery to date and describe any strategies to further integrate service delivery and any factors affecting the Local Board's decision to integrate or not to integrate service delivery.

SECTION 2 ECONOMIC and WORKFORCE INFORMATION ANALYSIS

The Governor’s vision of an effective workforce system committed to sector strategies will be advanced through data-driven strategic planning and investment and the development of workforce solutions that are responsive to the demands of industry. The State Board recognizes the importance of providing regional and local partners with the information necessary to understand their area’s economic climate. Regional and local partnerships will also be required to perform data-driven analyses to provide the most relevant economic information for their area. Regional workforce and economic development networks can then use this information as a basis for workforce and economic strategic planning, policy development and investment decisions.

Goal: Support system alignment, service integration and continuous improvement using data to support evidence-based policymaking.

Action: *Coordinate and develop high quality, actionable labor market information (LMI) data that assesses regional industry and occupational trends and needs and include a “skills gap” analysis.*

The Local Plan must include a detailed economic and workforce information analysis of the local area economy, consistent with WIA Section 118(b) and the Workforce Training Act.

Local economic and workforce information analysis should include the following elements:

- A description of the data gathered and the method of analysis and review;
- An assessment of the current economic situation and projected trends of the local area economy, industries and occupations, including major economic regions and industrial and occupational sectors;
- An assessment of the required workforce skills and knowledge individuals need in order to find employment in the priority sectors identified in the local area economic and workforce information analysis;
- A description of the characteristics and employment-related needs of the local area population and diverse sub-populations, including those from target

populations such as racial, ethnic, linguistic groups, older persons, individuals with disabilities, native Americans, etc.;

- Based on the local area economic and workforce information above, an analysis of the skill and education gaps for all individuals in priority sectors within the local area or region;
- An analysis of the challenges associated with the local area population attaining the education, skills, and training needed to obtain employment; and
- A discussion of the ability of the local area's workforce programs to meet the skill needs of priority sector employers in the local area or region and close any identified skill gaps.

Local Boards are encouraged to partner with neighboring Local Boards to conduct the economic and workforce information analysis regionally as appropriate. Recent (less than 2 years old) economic and workforce information that answers and is responsive to the bullets above can be used to satisfy this requirement.

SECTION 3 BUSINESS SERVICE PLAN

The Governor believes that by building an industry-responsive, well-coordinated workforce development system, California will maximize the return on its limited resources and make its education and training programs work for California's employers and working families. The Governor also recognizes the importance of targeting workforce investment resources in support of priority sectors and clusters that will create a vibrant economy with shared prosperity for all. The Governor believes California must build on and strengthen private sector partnerships so its training systems are nimble enough to adapt to the changing needs of the 21st century global economy.

Goal: Meet the workforce needs of high demand sectors of the state and regional economies.

Consistent with the Workforce Training Act, the CLEO and their Local Board shall establish a Business Service Plan that integrates local business involvement with workforce initiatives. This Business Service Plan at a minimum shall include the following:

- Description of a sub-committee of the Local Board that further develops and makes recommendations for the Business Service Plan to the Local Board in an effort to increase employer involvement in the activities of the Local Board. The sub-committee members should be comprised of business representatives on the Local Board who represent both the leading industries and employers in the relevant regional economy and potential emerging sectors that have significant potential to contribute to job growth in the relevant local area or regional economy, if investments were made for training and education programs. If such a sub-committee does not currently exist, describe the steps the Local Board will take to establish this sub-committee and include its formation in the Local Board's bylaws [UI Code Section 14200(c)(9)(C)];
- Description of the types of services the Local Board offers to businesses, including a description of how the CLEO and Local Board intend to:
 - Determine the employer needs in the local or regional area;
 - Integrate business services, including WPA services, to employers through the One-Stop delivery system; and

- Leverage and braid other resources through education, economic development and industry associations to support OJT and other customized training ventures.
- Describe the actions the CLEO and Local Board will take to partner with businesses to:
 - Identify the workforce training and educational barriers to attracting jobs in the local area or regional economy;
 - Identify existing skill gaps reducing the competitiveness of local businesses in the local area or regional economy; and
 - Identify priority sectors that would likely contribute to job growth in the local area or regional economy if investments were made for training and educational programs.
- Describe how the CLEO and Local Board will:
 - Partner with priority-sector employers to develop potential OJT and other customized training strategies;
 - Encourage business partners to help drive the demand-driven strategy through joint planning, competency and curriculum development; and determining appropriate lengths of training;
 - Work collaboratively with business and industry and the education community to develop strategies to overcome barriers to skill achievement and employment experienced by the populations in high-growth, high-demand industries and to ensure they are being identified as a critical pipeline of workers;
 - Foster collaboration between community colleges and DIR-DAS approved apprenticeship programs for the planned use of WIA Title I funds for the provision of training through registered apprenticeship programs and how programs and services funded by the WIA and directed to apprenticeable occupations, including pre-apprenticeship training, are conducted, to the maximum extent feasible, in coordination with one or

more apprenticeship programs approved by the DIR-DAS for the occupation and geographic area (UI Code Section 14230(3));

- Use innovative training strategies to fill skills gaps [include the Local Board's efforts to leverage additional resources to maximize the use of Individual Training Accounts through partnerships with business, education (in particular, community and technical colleges), economic development agencies, and industry associations, and how business and industry involvement is used to drive this strategy];
- Promote Rapid Response as a positive, proactive, business-friendly service, rather than as a reactive service; and
- Identify how Rapid Response will be used to expand the range and quality of services available to companies and affected workers and to develop an effective early layoff warning network.

SECTION 4 ADULT STRATEGIES

By utilizing shared strategies, California's statewide workforce investment system will focus on helping students and workers obtain industry-recognized certificates, credentials and degrees in priority sectors and fill critical labor market skills gaps to create stable, reliable jobs providing economic security that will achieve a shared prosperity for all Californians and their communities.

Goal: Increase the number of Californians, including from underrepresented demographic groups, who complete at least one year of postsecondary education with a marketable credential or degree, with a special emphasis on veterans, disabled individuals, and other at-risk populations.

- Describe the CLEO and Local Board's vision for alignment of the regional education system to develop career pathways and meet the educational needs of workers and priority-sector employers in the local area or regional economy. Include detailed actions to address the following state priorities:
 - Increase the capacity of community colleges and adult education to provide CTE;
 - Increase the number of career pathway programs in demand industries;
 - Increase the number of adult basic education students who successfully transition to postsecondary education, training or employment and reduce the time students spend in remediation;
 - Increase the number of underprepared job seekers and displaced workers who enter and successfully complete education and training programs in demand industries and occupations;
 - Develop and implement a strategic layoff aversion strategy that helps retain workers in their current jobs and provides rapid transitions to new employment minimizing periods of unemployment; and
 - Expand the availability of and participation in "Earn and Learn" models such as apprenticeships, OJT and other customized training where workers can build skills while working.

SECTION 5 YOUTH STRATEGIES

The Governor believes California must have a well-educated and highly-skilled workforce in order to remain prosperous and competitive in the 21st century global economy.

Goal: Increase the number of high school students, including those from underrepresented demographic groups, who graduate prepared for postsecondary education and/or a career.

- Describe the CLEO and Local Board vision for increasing the educational attainment of youth, consistent with the following state priorities:
 - Increase the number of high school students who complete a challenging education, including math gateway coursework and industry-themed pathways that prepare them for college, “Earn and Learn” training through apprenticeships, OJT, etc., and other postsecondary training; and
 - Increase opportunities for high school students and disconnected youth to transition into postsecondary education and careers.

Include the following:

- Description of the local area or region’s eligible youth population and any special or specific needs they may face which are unique to the local area or region;
- Youth activities available in the local area or region (Identify successful providers of such activities);
- Description of the CLEO and Local Board strategies to promote collaboration between the workforce investment system, education, human services, juvenile justice, and other systems to better serve youth that are most in need and have significant barriers to employment, and to successfully connect them to education and training opportunities that lead to successful employment (How is the Local Board promoting a collaborative cross-agency approach for both policy development and service delivery at the local level for youth?);

- Organizations or bodies designed to guide and inform an integrated vision for serving youth in the regional economy within the context of workforce investment, social services, juvenile justice, and education (describe the membership of such bodies and the functions and responsibilities in establishing priorities and services for youth);
- Description of the use and development of demand-driven models with business and industry working collaboratively with the workforce investment system and education partners to develop strategies for bringing these youth successfully into the workforce pipeline with the right skills;
- Practices used to ensure continuous quality improvement in the youth program; and
- The CLEO and Local Board's strategy, goals and objectives for ensuring that every youth has the opportunity for developing and achieving career goals through education and workforce training, including the youth most in need of assistance, such as out-of-school youth, homeless youth, youth in foster care, youth aging out of foster care, youth offenders, children of incarcerated parents, migrant and seasonal farmworker youth, youth with disabilities and other at-risk youth.

SECTION 6 ADMINISTRATION

Goal: Support system alignment, service integration and continuous improvement using data to support evidence-based policymaking.

- Describe how the Local Board is a community leader on workforce issues compared with other organizations;
- Describe how the local planning process took into account the entire workforce training pipeline for the relevant regional economy, including partners in K-12 education, career technical and vocational education, the community college system, other postsecondary institutions, and other LWIAs;
- Describe how the local planning process involved key stakeholders; including the major priority-sector employers in the relevant regional economy and organized labor (include written documentation of stakeholder involvement);
- Describe the process used by the Local Board to provide an opportunity for public comment, including comment by representatives of businesses, and comment by representatives of labor organizations, and input into the development of the Local Plan, prior to submission of the plan. Include with the Local Plan any such comments that represent disagreement with the plan;
- Identify the entity responsible for the disbursement of grant funds. Provide a description of the competitive process used to award the grants and contracts in the LWIA for activities carried out under this plan;
- Describe the LWIA One-Stop system. Include as an attachment a list of the One-Stop locations in the LWIA;
- Provide a comprehensive list of all services provided in each One-Stop in the LWIA;
- Describe the CLEO and Local Board strategies to ensure that the full range of employment and training programs and services delivered through the LWIA One-Stop delivery system are accessible to, and will meet the needs of, dislocated workers, displaced homemakers, low-income individuals, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, women, minorities, individuals training for non-traditional employment, veterans, public assistance recipients and individuals

- with multiple barriers to employment (including older individuals, limited English proficiency individuals, and persons with disabilities);
- Describe the CLEO and Local Board strategies to support the creation, sustainability, and growth of small businesses and support for the workforce needs of small businesses as part of the larger economic strategy;
 - Describe the strategies in place to ensure that sufficient system resources are being spent to support training of individuals in priority sectors;
 - Describe how WIA funds will be used to leverage and braid other federal, state, local and private resources (how do these coordinated and leveraged resources lead to a more effective local system that expands the involvement of business, employers and individuals?);
 - Describe how the Local Board will ensure the continuous improvement of training providers listed on the ETPL and ensure that such providers meet the employment needs of local area employers and participants;
 - Describe how the Local Board is serving UI claimants and potential TAA program service recipients;
 - Describe how the Local Board recognizes opportunities to prepare workers for “green jobs” related to other sources of federal funding;
 - Describe the policies in place to integrate the federal and/or state registered apprenticeship programs and the Job Corps in the local One-Stop system;
 - Provide a copy of the Local Board’s bylaws; and
 - Describe the process by which the Local Plan will be updated to include new and relevant information.

SECTION 7 MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING

The WIA requires that a MOU between the Local Board and each of the One-Stop partners concerning the operation of the One-Stop delivery system be executed. A copy of each MOU must be included with the Local Plan [WIA Section 118(b)(2)(B)].

If the Local Plan identifies specific services that are delivered by a One-Stop partner, the MOU with that partner shall describe what that relationship is and contain the required elements below. A copy of an executed MOU shall be included for every required partner program identified in WIA.

The MOUs may be developed as a single umbrella document, or as singular agreements between the partners and the Local Board. The MOUs should present in specific terms member contributions and the mutual methodologies used in overseeing the operations of the One-Stop system.

WIA Section 121(c)(1) and (2) and UI Code Section 14230(d) require each MOU to describe:

- The services to be provided through the One-Stop system;
- How the services and operating costs will be funded (please include any Resource Sharing Agreements);
- The methods used for referral of individuals between the One-Stop operator and partners;
- The duration of the MOU;
- The procedures that have been developed for amending the MOU;
- Other provisions as deemed necessary by the Local Board; and
- The Local Board's policy for identifying individuals who, because of their skills or experience, should be referred immediately to training services.

SECTION 8 LOCAL WIA COMMON MEASURE PERFORMANCE GOALS

[UI Code 14221(c)]

WIA SECTION 136(b) COMMON MEASURES	STATE GOAL (Proposed)	LWIA GOAL
<u>ADULT</u>		
Entered Employment	49.8%	
Employment Retention	77.5%	
Average Six-Months Earnings	\$12,428	
<u>DISLOCATED WORKER</u>		
Entered Employment	56.4%	
Employment Retention	81.1%	
Average Six-Months Earnings	\$18,543	
<u>YOUTH COMMON MEASURES</u>		
Placement in Employment or Education	66.5%	
Attainment of a Degree or Certificate	52.0%	
Literacy and Numeracy	42.4%	

The Local Board must include an analysis of the WIA regression tables and local or regional economic impacts that support the proposed targets. This is especially critical for any significant increase or decrease in a proposed target from past years.

California Integrated Service Delivery Final Evaluation Report

Executive Summary

August, 2011

Prepared for:

The California Workforce Investment Board



By

Richard W. Moore, Ph.D.

Gerard Rossy, Ph.D.

William Roberts, Ph.D.

Kenneth Chapman, Ph.D.

Douglas Orlando

Chris Hanley, MBA

Elna Amelchenko, MBA

The College of Business and Economics

California State University

Northridge

Acknowledgements

Research is a collective effort and requires the support and cooperation of many people, so we have many people to thank. We must begin with the staff and clients at 20 local areas who cooperated with this study and allowed us into their OneStops to collect data and observe their operations. Since we promised them anonymity, we cannot name them here, but we can thank them. Without their willingness to help us take an objective look at Integrated Service Delivery there would not have been a study.

We had an advisory committee of leaders from the field who provided advice at each stage of the research process and provided us with a host of insights, they are:

Bryan Rogers , Dennis Petrie, Steve Saxton, Roy Stanton, Debbie Briscoe , Susan Ayres, Sandy Harmsen, Kathleen Oles, John Delmatier, Reg Javier, Judy Chen-Lee, Judy Serna , Patricia Andrews, Felicia Flournoy, Loren Sims, Dianne Ferrari, Vickie Nasman, James Diaz, Jan Cedano, and Lillian Kirimlidis.

Dennis Petrie of Employment Development Department (EDD) provided valuable insights about the history of the ISD innovation and complexity of the larger workforce system. We have to thank Art O'Neil and Annette Wolfgang of EDD for supplying data to the study. We also want to thank EDD for lending us Doug Orlando to be part of the study team, his expertise in WIA financing and operations were invaluable to us.

The sponsor of the study was the California Workforce and Investment Board, (CWIB). We want to thank members past and present for their willingness to support this project and their interest in understanding the impact of ISD. Doug Sale, Ken Quesada and Mitzi Magtoto provided valuable support throughout the project. Barbara Halsey, formerly Executive Director of CWIB and now Executive Director of the California Workforce Association (CWA) played an important role in launching the project and advising us throughout. We must particularly thank Bev Odom of the CWIB staff, who was our counterpart. She was literally available to us night and day, helped keep us on our project time line and provided valuable feedback on our work throughout.

Virginia Hamilton, former Executive Director of CWA helped to conceptualize and launch the project.

Finally, we have to thank our colleagues at California State University, Northridge who supported the project: Madeleine Moore who helped with the survey of ISD practices, Scott Perez and Mack Johnson in the Office of Research and Sponsored projects who managed the contracting aspects of the project, and lastly, our friends and family who listened to us talk about this project for two years.

Executive Summary

In January 2010 the California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) contracted with researchers at California State University, Northridge to evaluate the “Integrated Service Delivery” (ISD) initiative. This initiative was designed to integrate the work of local Workforce Investment Act Programs with Wagner-Peyser programs inside California OneStops. At the time this study began 12 local WIA areas had joined the initiative and integrated their programs in the 2008-09 program year. These sites, which were called “Learning Labs”, were halfway through their second year of operation as ISD sites when our evaluation began; they have just completed their third year of ISD implementation. Our evaluation project had two phases. In Phase I a formative evaluation of the program examined the implementation of ISD¹; in Phase II a summative evaluation of the program measured ISD’s impact. This report provides the results of the summative evaluation which measured the impact of the ISD initiative on four aspects of OneStop Centers’ performance: the volume of clients served, the performance on federal measures, the cost and volume of services produced by OneStops, and the client satisfaction with services received.

Based on our analysis we recommend that CWIB take the following strategic actions:

1. Encourage but not mandate the existing ISD model.
2. Have all local areas enroll all clients.

To implement these strategies we recommend the following policies:

3. Over a five year period locate a substantial EDD presence in all comprehensive OneStops.
4. State should establish shared performance measures for local WIA and EDD operations, and evaluate them through an integrated data management system.
5. Incent local areas to integrate with EDD by providing preference to integrated OneStops in the award of discretionary funds.
6. Continue to support identification, evaluation and the dissemination of best practices among OneStops, local WIA areas and EDD.

Research Approach

This study set out to answer five evaluation questions about the Integrated Service Delivery as it was implemented in California.

1. To what degree have specific features of the ISD model been implemented at ISD and non-ISD local areas?
2. What impact has the ISD model had on the volume of clients served?
3. What impact has the ISD model had on performance on federal performance measures?
4. What impact has the ISD model had on the cost and volume of services produced?
5. What impact has the ISD model had on customer satisfaction?

To answer these questions in a summative evaluation, we had to separate what happened in the ISD Local Areas from what would have happened without ISD. The difference between what did happen and what would have happened without ISD is the ISD program’s impact. To meet this

¹ The complete report of the Phase I formative evaluation is available in the projects First Report *California Integrated Service Delivery- Phase I Report* on California Workforce Investment Board’s website <http://www.cwib.ca.gov/page/library/ISD%20Report%20Master%20V-1-120710.pdf> .

challenge we used a method known as matched pairs. We were fortunate to have a natural experiment in California. Twelve local areas volunteered to be Learning Labs and implemented the ISD model in the 2007-08, while 37 others did not volunteer. To estimate the impact of the ISD model, we compared the experience of ten of the twelve ISD sites, which volunteered to be in the study, with ten other local areas that did not join the ISD initiative. The ten non-ISD sites were chosen based on their similarity to the ISD sites on key dimensions. Comparing individual ISD sites with their matched pair allowed us to assess the overall impact of ISD.

Results

To what degree have specific features of the ISD model been implemented at ISD and non-ISD local areas?

Surprisingly, prior to implementation of ISD, non-ISD sites in our study reported slightly greater use of the ISD practices than the ISD sites. After implementation, while ISD sites reported a greater increase in the use of integrated practices, those same practices also increased at non-ISD sites (although to a lesser degree). In fact, the difference in the use of these practices between ISD and non-ISD sites proved to be much smaller than anticipated. Both ISD and non-ISD sites indicated that in the future they plan to continue most of the ISD practices they have in place and it seems likely that the gap between ISD and non-ISD site will become even smaller. In short, non-ISD sites implemented many ISD practices while ISD sites did not implement all ISD practices. In practice, we have a system where each of the twenty sites in the study is a blend of ISD and traditional management practices. One practice that is unique to ISD sites is the attempt to formally enroll all clients in WIA rather than have a pool of universal clients who are not enrolled in the program. We found that this practice had a profound effect on how many clients were served, the characteristics of clients served, and the performance of local areas on the federal measures.

What impact has the ISD model had on the volume of clients served?

Perhaps the most consistent and dramatic finding in this study is that adopting the ISD model leads to a dramatic increase in the number of clients served. This proved true for both the number of “enrolled clients” and for the total number of clients overall. Even when we included universal clients in the comparison and controlled for other differences between sites, ISD sites still served more clients than comparable non-ISD sites.

The reasons for the increase in enrolled clients are, in a sense, easily explained. ISD sites set out to “enroll everyone through the door”. So, even if the number of people served did not go up, the number enrolled would increase dramatically. But the increase in total volume, even after accounting for universal clients that would have been served without ISD, indicates that ISD had a profound impact on the sheer volume of clients. To be frank, this surprised us. We expected that the hassle of completing the paper work required to enroll would discourage some clients and that once we accounted for universal clients that would have otherwise been served, the total client volume would decline. It may be that there are aspects of the ISD model that are very attractive to clients and that keeps them coming in.

What impact has the ISD model had on performance on the federal measures?

It is an open secret in WIA that managers affect their performance on the federal measures by controlling whom they enroll and when they exit clients. The ISD goal of enrolling everyone and the state level practice of automatically exiting clients after they have not received services for 90 days

(called “soft exits”) meant local managers could not control their performance measures as easily and that this, in turn, would lead to a decline in performance compared to similar sites that could continue these practices. Our analysis of the performance data supports this. Even after controlling for the effects of the recession and local economic conditions, ISD sites experienced a significant drop on all federal performance measures for adults and dislocated workers when compared to other similar non-ISD sites.

What impact has the ISD model had on the cost and volume of services produced?

The most significant finding from our analysis of costs and volume of services produced is that there are dramatic economies of scale available in OneStop operations. The economic downturn that started in 2007 put tremendous pressure on all OneStops (both ISD and non-ISD) to serve more clients. Both ISD and non-ISD OneStops responded and served the increased number of clients at a substantial reduction in cost per client. For example, we found the cost per visit dropped by over eighty percent.

We did not observe the dramatic cost differences between ISD and non-ISD sites that we had anticipated. We found no material differences in either costs or service volume in the area of business services. Both ISD and non-ISD sites involved in providing business services, appear to have developed a good working relationship between WIA and EDD in this area. We did find that EDD operations at integrated sites have made some significant adjustments in their resource allocations. EDD operations at ISD sites have shifted the use of resources away from the provision of core services into the longer-term, intensive services that traditionally were provided primarily by WIA operations. However, we found no major differences in how resources were allocated by WIA at ISD and non-ISD sites.

What impact has the ISD model had on customer satisfaction?

We did not know what to expect about the impact of ISD on customer satisfaction. On one hand, we expected that customers at ISD sites would receive more personal attention and services that could lead to higher satisfaction. On the other hand, with clients having to go through the enrollment process, along with the added stress placed on local staff from trying to enroll everyone, we expected that there would be lower customer satisfaction at ISD sites. Our analysis of customer satisfaction at ISD and non-ISD sites led us to conclude that the ISD innovation does not have a strong positive or negative impact on client satisfaction. We did find that customer satisfaction was relatively high across the board in all (ISD and non-ISD) OneStops we studied. With average satisfaction scores of 8 or higher on a ten point scale on many aspects of satisfaction, it may be that there is little room for improvement on these measures. It may also be that customer satisfaction is driven more by the quality of local management and staff at individual sites rather than the larger program design.

Strategic Options

In the original framework both EDD and California Workforce Association committed to ultimately expanding the ISD model to all OneStops in California. The question confronting the CWIB now is whether or not to pursue the goal of expanding ISD to all local areas. In our view, the CWIB has four mutually exclusive strategic options related to ISD and two independent strategic options related to WIA enrollment policies.

ISD mutually exclusive strategic options:

1. A laissez faire approach, in which the CWIB allows local areas to continue integration or not as a local decision.
2. A policy of encouraging and supporting integration, but not mandating it.
3. Requiring some selected elements of ISD, but not mandating all.
4. Mandating integration in all local areas.

Independent strategic options:

1. Implement a state-wide policy of enrolling everyone coming through the door at OneStops into WIA.
2. Return all OneStops to a universal service strategy.

Each of these options has important implications for other actions, and in particular for the design of a new data system for both WIA and EDD programs. The options chosen will also have profound implications for the state's performance on federal measures and for the relationship between EDD and WIA programs at the state and local level.

Strategic Recommendations.

We recommend two strategic options and some additional recommendations for implementing the strategies.

1. Encourage but not mandate the existing ISD model.

We believe that the most effective strategy to support the continued dissemination of successful ISD practices across the state is to encourage but not mandate these ISD practices in local areas. Local areas have clearly adapted their approaches to address the unique needs of their clients and local leaders believe that local autonomy is critical to effectively meet local needs. While the benefits of many ISD practices appear to be accepted by most, if not all, local areas, individual practices vary in how useful they are based on local conditions.

2. Have all local areas enroll all clients.

Enrolling all clients was the element of the ISD model that yielded the biggest impact on who the system served and the performance of the system. Evidence shows that this change will lead to WIA serving both more clients overall and proportionately more disadvantaged clients (a group that needs the services more). For example, we found that ISD sites served a larger proportion of low income and ex-offender clients than non-ISD sites. In addition, we found ISD sites allocated more resources to intensive services.

Further, a system in which some local areas enroll everyone while others selectively enroll fewer clients makes statewide data on who was served and, more importantly, performance meaningless for managing the system. In short, we believe that CWIB should not sanction a system where different local areas are able to count enrollments and measure performance on different bases. Finally, this change will lead to more honest representation of how the system performs on the federal measures.

We do not mean to make light of the challenge and costs that such a change will pose for local areas. The creation of a new shared data system for both WIA and EDD, however, offers a special

opportunity to ease the burden of enrolling all clients by both agencies. With this policy in place, the implementation of the new data system could be shaped to streamline enrollment procedures, share data between the two programs and, ultimately, lower costs of enrolling all clients.

Implementation Recommendations

The following implementation recommendations deal with specific actions the board can take to support the two strategies recommended above.

3. Over a five year period locate a substantial EDD presence in all comprehensive OneStops.

A major constraint to effective integration of EDD and WIA programs was limited participation by EDD in many OneStops, even in some of the designated ISD sites. The original vision for WIA was to bring all employment and training programs together under one roof to improve services to clients. At this stage of development, the system should at least integrate the two largest players in the system.

4. State should establish shared performance measures for local WIA and EDD operations, and evaluate them through an integrated data management system.

One cannot expect public agencies to work collaboratively when they are held accountable to different standards. We strongly recommend that the CWIB develop performance measures that are shared by EDD and WIA in all local areas. These measures should go beyond the basic federal performance measures and consider other factors such as customer satisfaction, efficiency and the volume of clients served. Shared performance measures create an incentive for local managers and staff to find new and innovative ways to deliver effective services without centralized controls. These standards will send a clear message to managers in both agencies that collaboration is important and it needs to be done well.

5. Incent local areas to integrate with EDD by providing preference to integrated OneStops in the award of discretionary funds.

Our experience is that incentives work better than regulation in getting organizations to change. We therefore recommend that CWIB explore ways to give preference to integrated sites in the award of discretionary funds from WIA. For example, when an RFP is issued, local areas that are collocated and apply jointly with EDD could receive extra points for their proposals. In our view, this approach will be more likely to motivate local areas and EDD operations to find ways of working collaboratively rather than trying to drive them into cooperating through rules and monitoring. This policy can be phased in as co-location is put in place over a five-year period.

6. Continue to support identification, evaluation and dissemination of the best practices among OneStops, local areas and EDD.

This study found that many ISD practices had already spread to non-ISD sites. This is part of a natural process, where when local managers found out about something that worked elsewhere they adapted it for their own use. A logical role for the CWIB is to promote this diffusion process by continuing to support objective study and evaluation of the ISD approach, as well as creating opportunities for local programs to share best practices. The information generated by such studies can provide valuable information about how the system works and generate discussion about how to

improve the system further. As ISD evolves, ongoing research can assess the impact of innovations on performance outcomes.

Integrated Service Delivery Evaluation Results DRAFT Next Steps

Background

The One Stop Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) Initiative, supported by the State Board and Employment Development Department (EDD) in partnership with the California Workforce Association (CWA), attempted to learn how services provided by WIA Title I (WIA) and WIA Title III (EDD) employment services could be best integrated at the local One-Stop level by co-enrolling all participants in both programs and redesigning service delivery. The State Board contracted with California State University, Northridge (CSU Northridge) in January 2010 to conduct a two-phased formative and summative evaluation of the ISD initiative. The first phase formative evaluation report was discussed at CWA and State Board meetings in November 2010. The second and final evaluation findings were discussed with the State Board August 2011 and with local workforce investment area staff at the California Workforce Association conference September 2011. The State Board will address evaluation findings and recommendations through its Issues and Policies Committee in conjunction with EDD, CWA and local workforce staff.

Recommendations:

Evaluators recommend the State take the following strategic actions:

1. Encourage but not mandate the existing ISD model.
2. Have all Local Areas enroll all clients.

To implement these strategies they recommend the following policies:

3. Over a five year period locate a substantial EDD presence in all comprehensive One-Stops.
4. State should establish shared performance measures for local WIA and EDD operations, and evaluate them through an integrated data management system.
5. Incent local areas to integrate with EDD by providing preference to integrated One-Stops in the award of discretionary funds.
6. Continue to support identification, evaluation and the dissemination of best practices among One-Stops, Local Areas and EDD.

Policy and/or Strategic Action:

1. Encourage but Not Mandate the Existing ISD Model

Pros:

- Mandating all to implement ISD model would allow for more uniform system of One-Stops
- Performance data would be more meaningful; would increase official count of people being served and would guarantee an EDD presence in every comprehensive One-Stop

Cons:

- Mandating everyone implement ISD would reduce local autonomy and instill resistance from some areas.
- It would cause a steep drop in statewide performance levels and might stifle innovation.
- It would require a significant restructuring of EDD operations and the State would need to develop a regulatory process to enforce the practices.

Recommendation:

Encourage but not mandating ISD implementation is most realistic strategy.

Strategies:

State would need to provide technical assistance and capacity building to help with implementation and may need to provide incentive money and/or other supports and to address barriers to implementation such as co-location with EDD, streamlined and integrated data systems, common process and outcome measures, effective practices to address administrative burden of enrolling all clients.

The State would need to allow for lower local performance levels for those implementing ISD, including getting a federal DOL waiver for lower state performance levels if enough sites implement this service delivery strategy.

2. Have All Local Areas Enroll All Clients

Pros:

- Increases official count and improves perception of WIA productivity
- Uniform statewide method for measuring volume of clients served and performance.
- Allows for One-Stops to enroll and serve more individuals with many barriers who are hardest to serve
- Eliminates the disincentive to enroll hardest to serve individuals

Cons:

- Federal performance levels will be lower
- Increased administrative costs to enroll all clients

Recommendation:

Have all local areas register all clients into universal/core services and enroll all clients who receive intensive and training services.

Strategies:

Other states and local ISD Areas that enrolled all clients experienced lower performance levels on the WIA common measures, so California would need to negotiate lower state level performance levels with the federal Dept. of Labor if enough local areas implement the ISD model. The State would need to develop policy mandating enrollment or registration of all

clients, however would need to provide more funding and technical assistance to support the additional reporting burden.

The streamlined enrollment process would need to meet federal data collection requirements and if not, State would need to get a waiver from federal Dept. of Labor such as to allow paperless eligibility documentation. The State and Local Workforce Areas would need to develop, support and share clear, cost effective, and streamlined ways to consistently register all visitors into core services for the purpose of counting services, then to further enroll clients into intensive and training services which would fall under WIA Performance.

The forthcoming new statewide data system presents an opportunity to assist in easing administrative burden for both clients and staff. The One Stop system would clearly communicate the need for necessary right to work, selective service, and income and employment documentation at all points of contact with clients.

3. Over a Five Year Period Locate a Substantial EDD Presence in All Comprehensive One-Stops:

Pros:

- One-Stops would have sufficient numbers of staff from both EDD and WIA to fully staff all key functions
- Would create better alignment between both funding streams and efficiencies for staff and clients
- Would support the original intent of WIA regarding the user experience of a comprehensive One-Stop center
- Would require the State Board to more clearly define the required partnerships in a comprehensive One-Stop center

Cons:

Might be problematic or resource intensive for EDD to realign existing regional and statewide administrative processes to different local workforce area processes.

Recommendation:

Phase in a substantial EDD presence in all comprehensive One-Stop centers.

Strategies:

Due to regional statewide administrative and staffing processes, some One-Stops have many EDD staff while others are not as well represented by EDD. The evaluation found that effective implementation necessitates that One-Stops have sufficient numbers of staff from both EDD and WIA to so all key functions can be staffed by both agencies. One-Stops centers with sufficient EDD management presence resulted in better integration.

Better alignment between State and local government building requirements is another area needing attention. The One-Stop Premises Workgroup would continue work on mitigating these issues including developing recommendations for further action or policy via the Issues and Policies Committee.

4. State Should Establish Shared Performance Measures for Local WIA and EDD Operations and Evaluate Them Through an Integrated Data Management System.

Pros:

- Shared performance measures create an incentive for local staff and managers to find new and innovative ways to effectively deliver more relevant services to shared clients
- Common measures help minimize reporting and administrative burdens and support integration.

Cons:

- Different accountability and program standards are problematic to effective integration
- Different data systems and measures prohibit collaboration and contribute to administrative and service barriers that divert time and resources resulting in barriers to ISD implementation.

Recommendation:

State establish shared performance measures for WIA and EDD operations and evaluate them through an integrated data management system.

Strategies:

Current and planned implementation of the new statewide data system could address better integration of EDD and WIA data systems

People working on phasing in the new statewide integrated data management system would be aware of and address the data issues cited in the evaluation

A performance measures workgroup would be formed to identify the best way in which to consolidate WIA Title III and Title I measures in the most meaningful way while addressing federal mandates

The workgroup would consider both process and outcome measures and consist of people with performance management, data and program expertise with representation from all state and local partners and federal staff. If necessary, waivers might be needed for some measures.

5. Incent Local Areas to Integrate with EDD by Providing Preference to Integrated One-Stops in the Award of Discretionary Funds.

Pros:

- Creates additional resources to support implementation and ease burdens for ISD sites
- Provides incentives for local area and EDD operations to find ways to work collaboratively

Cons:

- Reduction of federal funding available for discretionary projects has minimized the potential impact of this recommendation

- Might conflict with High Performing Board policy in terms of lower WIA performance levels that result when all One-Stop clients are enrolled.

Recommendation:

State should include criteria for evaluating local boards for high performance certification and if funds are restored, incent local areas to integrate with EDD by providing extra points or preference when awarding discretionary funds

Strategies:

Include the requirement in the high performing board criteria. Initially, all discretionary grants administered by EDD and the State Board would be designed to give extra points to ISD sites. Additional State Board incentive awards would incorporate extra points for ISD site.

Any potential contradiction with the new state law on High Performing Boards would be addressed during planning and implementation.

6. Continue to Support Identification, Evaluation and Dissemination of Best Practices Among One-Stops, Local Workforce Areas and EDD.

Pros:

- Improves services to shared clients
- Supports effective implementation
- Creates energy and helps mobilize staff
- Results in better outcomes

Cons:

- Best practice in one area may not be of value in another local area
- Need to develop evaluative criteria to ensure proper identification of a best practice

Strategies:

Work can be developed by State Board, CWA, Local Workforce Area and EDD staff with input from the Issues and Policies Committee.

Metrics for what determines a best practice would need to be identified including an objective study and evaluation of the practices. These would help inform One-Stop certification.

Work would focus first on streamlining registration and enrollment process and integrated practices between EDD and WIA and eventually all significant One-Stop partner agencies.

Utilize the web-portal for dissemination and promotion of best practices

Common Measures and Definitions

Adults and Dislocated Workers

Entered Employment:

Individuals working at any time during the quarter after leaving the program (Job Attainment)

Employment Retention:

Individuals still working in the 2nd and 3rd quarter after leaving the program (Job Maintenance)

Average Earnings:

Of those working for all three quarters after leaving the program, average earnings for a 6 months period (Wages for 6 months)

Youth

Placement in Employment/Education:

Youth working or in education/training in the quarter after leaving the program.

Attain Degree/Certificate:

Youth completing a degree or certificate program by the 3rd quarter after leaving the program.

Literacy/Numeracy (Lit/Num):

Youth out of school, basic skills deficient youth, achieving required gains during participation.

The State's Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) policy does not insure that the State list is available to all customers, and is missing performance information for initial eligibility of some training providers. Citations: WIA section 122(a)(C), (b) & (e)(4)(A)-(B); (g) & (f)(2); 663.440(a)-(c); 663.585; 663.515(c)(ii); 20 CFR 667.410(b)(2)(ii).

Summary: The State's policy guidance on the ETPL as it is written, does not ensure that the ETPL is being made available to all individuals throughout the State who are eligible for WIA training services. For example, in a handful of local workforce areas, including the City of Oakland and Riverside County, reviewers found that customers were not granted access to the statewide ETPL, but were given a separate, local listing of training providers. Additionally, the State's policy guidance notes that "performance is not considered in making initial eligibility determinations." This is only true for the training provider that are post-secondary education institutions and entities carrying out apprenticeship programs. For training providers that fit the criteria of WIA 122(a)(C), initial eligibility must be determined using appropriate performance as described under WIA.

Required Action: The State's policy guidance pertaining to the ETPL must clarify that all customers must be granted access to the statewide ETPL and, that local workforce areas cannot restrict customers to their own training provider lists. The State should also modify its policy to require performance information described in WIA 122(a)(C), for all training providers that are *not* community colleges, four year colleges, and registered apprenticeship training providers.

SEC. 122. IDENTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE PROVIDERS OF TRAINING SERVICES.

(a) Eligibility Requirements.--

(1) In general.--Except as provided in subsection (h), to be identified as an eligible provider of training services described in section 134(d)(4) (referred to in this section as "training services") in a local area and to be eligible to receive funds made available under section 133(b) for the provision of training services, a provider of such services shall meet the requirements of this section.

(2) Providers.--Subject to the provisions of this section, to be eligible to receive the funds, the provider shall be--

(A) a postsecondary educational institution that--

(i) is eligible to receive Federal funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(ii) provides a program that leads to an associate degree, baccalaureate degree, or certificate;

(B) an entity that carries out programs under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the "National Apprenticeship Act"; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.); or

(C) another public or private provider of a program of training services.

(b) Initial Eligibility Determination.--

(1) Postsecondary educational institutions and entities carrying out apprenticeship programs.--To be initially eligible to receive funds as described in subsection (a) to carry out a program described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2), a provider described in subparagraph (A) or (B), respectively, of subsection (a)(2) shall submit an application, to the local board for the local area in which the provider desires to provide training services, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the local board may require.

(e) (4) (A) - (B) Availability.--

(A) State list.--The designated State agency shall compile a single list of the providers identified under paragraph (3) from all local areas in the State and disseminate such list, and the performance information and program cost information described in paragraph (1), to the one-stop delivery systems within the State. Such list and information shall be made widely available to participants in employment and training activities authorized under section 134 and others through the one-stop delivery system.

(B) Selection from state list.--Individuals eligible to receive training services under section 134(d)(4) shall have the opportunity to select any of the eligible providers, from any of the local areas in the State, that are included on the list described in subparagraph (A) to provide the services, consistent with the requirements of section 134.

(f) Enforcement.--

(1) Accuracy of information.--If the designated State agency, after consultation with the local board involved, determines that an eligible provider or individual supplying information on behalf of the provider intentionally supplies inaccurate information under this section, the agency shall terminate the eligibility of the provider to receive funds described in subsection (a) for any program for a period of time, but not less than 2 years.

(2) Noncompliance.--If the designated State agency, or the local board working with the State agency, determines that an eligible provider described in subsection (a) substantially violates any requirement under this Act, the agency, or the local board working with the State agency, may terminate the eligibility of such provider to receive funds described in subsection (a) for the program involved or take such other action as the agency or local board determines to be appropriate.

(g) Appeal.--The Governor shall establish procedures for providers

of training services to appeal a denial of eligibility by the local board or the designated State agency under subsection (b), (c), or (e), a termination of eligibility or other action by the board or agency under subsection (f), or a denial of eligibility by a one-stop operator under subsection (h). Such procedures shall provide an opportunity for a hearing and prescribe appropriate time limits to ensure prompt resolution of the appeal.

Sec. 663.440 What are the requirements for consumer choice?

(a) Training services, whether under ITA's or under contract, must be provided in a manner that maximizes informed consumer choice in selecting an eligible provider.

(b) Each Local Board, through the One-Stop center, must make available to customers the State list of eligible providers required in WIA section 122(e). The list includes a description of the programs through which the providers may offer the training services, the information identifying eligible providers of on-the-job training and customized training required under WIA section 122(h) (where applicable), and the performance and cost information about eligible providers of training services described in WIA sections 122 (e) and (h).

(c) An individual who has been determined eligible for training services under Sec. 663.310 may select a provider described in paragraph (b) of this section after consultation with a case manager. Unless the program has exhausted training funds for the program year, the operator must refer the individual to the selected provider, and establish an ITA for the individual to pay for training. For purposes of this paragraph, a referral may be carried out by providing a voucher or certificate to the individual to obtain the training.

Sec. 663.585 May individuals choose training providers located outside of the local area?

Yes, individuals may choose any of the eligible providers and programs on the State list. A State may also establish a reciprocal agreement with another State(s) to permit providers of eligible training programs in each State to accept individual training accounts provided by the other State. (WIA secs. 122(e) (4) and (e) (5).)

667.410(b) (2) (ii) Ensure that established policies to achieve program quality and outcomes meet the objectives of the Act and the WIA regulations, including policies relating to: the provision of services by One-Stop Centers; eligible providers of training services; and eligible providers of youth activities;

**Issues and Policy Committee
Policy, System and Legislative Issues**

1. Inclusion and access to services for adults and youth with disabilities.
2. Youth Services ensure adequate planning focused on creating services that prepare youth for post-secondary education, workforce training and/or entrepreneurial opportunities
3. Ensure implementation of WIA services based on applied research. It is imperative that services are rendered according to the trends of real time data and analysis. This ensures that relevant policies are put in place to service the most current needs of the workforce.
4. In order to ensure effective communication throughout the system, it is imperative that the purpose of the system and its results are clearly defined and disseminated to Congress, employers and workers. We must know and understand who we are and how effective we are at what we do.
5. Every high school student who reaches the age of 18 while attending a traditional secondary school will be connected to the workforce investment system six months before exiting school.
6. Impact on CTE capacity -- if Prop 30 fails vs. if Prop 30 wins on Tuesday
7. Community Colleges on the ETPL list

Issues and Policy Special Committee Mission Statement

Our mission is to provide advice, counsel and recommendations to the full California Workforce Investment Board that improve Local Workforce Investment Boards' ability to provide world-class services to constituents; and to provide overall strategic recommendations to the full Board in identifying the most critical priorities.

State Board and Committee Calendar for 2013

For planning purposes, below are the meeting dates and times for the State Board and its Committees\Councils.

Full Board

February 13, 2013
May 15, 2013
August 13, 2013
November 12, 2013

Executive Committee

Week of January 21-25, 2013
Week of April 22-26, 2013
Week of July 22-26, 2013
Week of November 21-25, 2013

Health Workforce Development Council

January 16, 2013
April 17, 2013
July 17, 2013
October 16, 2013

Green Collar Jobs Council

November 27, 2012 – 1-3:30pm

Issues and Policies Committee

November 13, 2012 – 9:30-12:00pm

Advanced Manufacturing Committee

TBD

Item 4: Updates: WIA Standard Record Data Reporting

In its recent review of the State Board, the California State Auditor recommended the State Board establish:

- Clear definitions for terms, abbreviations and acronyms used in the strategic plan such as quality services,
- Performance measures specific to California for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of WIA-funded programs and activities.

Over the course of the next five years the State Board will identify additional measures to evaluate the accessibility, quality, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the core, intensive and training services provided to California's adult, dislocated worker and youth populations seeking employment in priority sectors and clusters identified in the CISI and Local Plans. Several of these measures will be incorporated into the State Board's performance dashboard, LWIB recertification and high performance LWIB certification policies and will also be included in the Annual Report to DOLETA. Below are examples of the types of measures the State Board will look at adopting:

1. Determine if underserved populations and those identified as most in need are receiving equal access to quality One-Stop services?
2. Determine if special needs populations such as veterans, the elderly, the disabled, offenders and at-risk youth are receiving equal access to quality One-Stop services?
3. Determine the educational level at entry of all individuals receiving WIA services.
4. Determine if individuals receiving only self-assisted core services realize long-term employment with living wages in targeted priority sectors and clusters as a direct result of core services.
5. Determine the types of intensive and training services individuals are receiving, such as on the job training, individual training account, skill upgrade, customized training, etc.
6. For each type of training service in WIASRD element #340, determine the rate of completion, placement and retention.
7. Determine if individuals receiving intensive and training services realize long-term employment with living wages in targeted priority sectors and clusters as a direct result of intensive and training services.

8. Determine if wage gains occurred as a result of receiving core, intensive and training services by comparing individual wage data prior to receiving WIA services and after receiving WIA services.
9. Identify the Occupational/Industry Code for all core, intensive and training recipients that achieved an employment outcome and compare these codes to the priority sectors and clusters identified in the Strategic Workforce Plan, CISI and Local Plan sector initiatives.

Item 5: Other Business

Item 6: Public Comment