

**Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin, Inc.
Youth Committee Meeting Minutes**

Randy Guttenberg, Chair; Laura Cataldo, Jim Falco, Alex Fralin, Rich Hands, Fred Hebert, Traci Jones, John Lalor, Nick Lampone, Francis Langer, Melissa Montey, Lisa Pollard, Brian Pulford, Elizabeth Roddy, Ed White

**May 9, 2019
8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.**

**Madison College Truax – Health Building
1705 Hoffman Street
Madison, WI 53704
Room 309**

Members Present: Randy Guttenberg, Chair; Laura Cataldo, Jim Falco, Alex Fralin, Francis Langer, Melissa Montey, Elizabeth Roddy, Ed White

Via Phone: Michelle Eilbes, John Lalor, Charles Poches, Lisa Pollard

Staff Present: Pat Schramm, Seth Lentz, Erin Bechen, Jackie Hall, Kim Larson, Chris Ziegel

Guests: Marshall Behringer, Jon Danforth, Julie Enloe, Lisa Hollman, Greg Markle, Melissa Sanchez-Cruz, Cyndy Sandberg, Howard Spearman, Chan Stroman

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome and Introductions

Guttenberg welcomed everyone and everyone introduced themselves.

Agenda Item 2 – Review and Approval of the February 8, 2019 Youth Committee Minutes

Guttenberg asked for a motion to approve the February 8, 2019 Youth Committee minutes as presented. Falco moved to approve the motion as presented. Poches offered a second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 3 – Status of Middle College Transition – Next Steps for Graduates

Schramm reviewed the logistics relating to the decision to discontinue the Middle College program. While the program has engaged a total lifetime participant count of 229, the funding shift in WIOA between in-school and out-of-school youth populations has forced a re-examination. Factors such as decreasing participant counts resulting in smaller cohorts and decreasing trends of participants

continuing on to additional technical college training after completion, increasing logistic challenges and costs are a few of the reasons behind the decision.

For those students who have been engaged in the program, we have processes in place and will be transferring participant responsibilities to the appropriate WIOA-contracted staff based on their status and planned next steps.

Agenda Item 4 – Update on DWD and Local Program Monitoring

Lentz detailed the processes behind the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) review and audit from January 22 through 25, 2019. Scope of the review and audit include, but not limited to governance, membership, program designs, fiscal & Equal Opportunity (EO) compliance, and on-site visits to various service delivery locations. Highlights to mention on the monitoring report include locally-developed monitoring tools, EO grievance procedures, and ongoing guidance work with DWD collaboration.

Areas of concern and finding areas are detail-oriented in nature, such as missing supporting documentation, and were able to be addressed. None of the issues identified involved questioned costs. Responses are due back to the DWD by June 21, 2019. Local program monitoring performed in November, focusing on performance, service delivery, and accessibility metrics, provided promising practices identified such as increased manager involvement with staff development as well as increased engagement between staff and potential participants.

Falco inquired if these findings are conducted per region or as an overall statistic. Schramm stated the review is per individual record. Lentz added the design is a local board decision, not about the design of the program but rather a compliance verification check. The local board reviews the local policies, whereas the DWD monitors the individual records of participants. Schramm pointed out the DWD monitoring also keeps an eye out for gross negligence.

Langer inquired how this compares to other workforce development boards. Schramm shared correspondence received from our WDB members who also serve on other WDBs communicate that our reports reflect fewer significant areas of concern. Lentz added monitoring also incorporates local policy adherence and that the focus on these issues has elevated in recent monitoring engagements.

Agenda Item 5 – Presentation on the South Central WI Youth Apprenticeship Program

Schramm introduced Behringer and Sandberg for Youth Apprenticeship. Sandberg detailed the history behind Youth Apprenticeship and their current focus. Shortages in the workforce, an increase in employers recognizing the advantages of youth apprenticeship, and additional academic & career advising within high schools all contribute to the increasing success of the program.

Youth Apprenticeship offers 11 (eleven) different pathways for student success with median wages increasing in formally low-wage industries such as hospitality and agriculture. Behringer added the



average wage for construction apprentices sits around \$25.00 an hour with HVAC apprentices making up to \$90,000.00 a year.

Sandberg continued explaining Youth Apprenticeship built to industry standards and the requirements of students eligible for the program. Students must be a junior or senior in high school (must be at least sixteen years of age), have a detailed individual career plan, have demonstrated appropriate school behavior, and satisfactory grades & attendance records.

White requested further explanation on the satisfactory grade requirement. Sandberg explained the decision is dependent upon school district, with the focus geared toward at-risk students. White questioned if the apprenticeship runs concurrent with their class attendance. Sandberg clarified the student must be attending school in order to stay qualified in the Youth Apprenticeship program. Schramm added the school integrates with the program to help students succeed.

Sandberg continued detailing the flexibility with hours attending school and the program. Fralin inquired on the detailed, individual career plan. Sandberg responded the Academic Career Plan (ACP) is built with the school based on classes taken and desired (re)location of the student.

Guttenberg highlighted that the program covers students who are disenfranchised with the high school experience as well as students attending university going into high level fields, demonstrating the program's appeal to a broad range of students. The program itself is not an alternative to schooling but rather a supplement.

Sandberg provided examples of prior students enrolled into Youth Apprenticeship who are working with companies on NASA-related contract work as well as a high school student performing lab work at the University of Wisconsin – Madison.

Sandberg gave an overview of employer benefits behind Youth Apprenticeship and the importance of preparing employers for participant struggles that may arise. Behringer added participants form trusting relationships with their mentors, leading to future success. Youth Apprenticeship helps to provide students with learning the soft skills that workers need to be successful in the day-to-day work environment.

Sandberg provided a review of employer expectations and the requirement of the student fulfilling different responsibilities within the apprenticeship. Fralin inquired on the assessment of the trainer. Sandberg provided detail on mentor training being an option if the employer or company feel it will be beneficial, and the push toward enhancing training strategies if students are at risk of not successfully attaining the necessary skills.

Schramm questioned if the training is completed as a group. Behringer confirmed this is the case and the training focuses on youth development by overcoming the struggles of the youth. Sandberg added that the program helps to provide employers with recognizing and addressing cultural differences some of the disadvantaged youth and non-disadvantaged youth may be facing but not always able to articulate.



Behringer noted employee resource groups (ERGs) can be utilized dependent upon the size of the employer. Representation for the student or mentor is vitally important, and the program is always trying to pair students to mentors which benefit the youth, mentor, and company.

Sandberg presented a sample of the IT Skills checklist, which is filled out by the employer rating the student on the functions at the job site. Once complete, the checklist is sent to the state and the student receives the credential.

Lalor inquired on program obstacles such as transportation logistics considering the desire to engage more disadvantaged youth. Schramm explained the program is not funded through Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) funds. The funding is set at \$900.00 per student, allowing for some flexible options like bus passes and van share options. Schramm reemphasized that scale is a challenge with a fixed participant cost.

Lalor noted that CESA #5 covers part of our six county region but is not part of our collaboration. He further inquired if their absence is a challenge to operations. Schramm responded CESA #5 was involved in the collaborative in prior years but elected to pursue other options independent of our collaboration. Schramm noted that we continue to reach out and collaborate when appropriate, and may revisit alignment in the future but their lack of inclusion in the collaboration hasn't hindered our collaboration's success.

Sandberg finished the presentation stating the program has experience in dealing with employer concerns on a variety of topics like insurance, union concurrence, and other corporation concerns. Insurance-related issues such as employment of students under the age of eighteen can be handled between the employer and their insurance carrier. Corporation- and union-related issues are decreasing as most are realizing the necessity of having these students partake in Youth Apprenticeship to help further the goals of the corporations and unions.

Agenda Item 6 - Recommendation for July 1, 2019 Funding for WIOA Youth Programs

Schramm detailed the logistics behind recommendation one, focusing on targeted populations for in-school youth, with priorities to the aging-out-of-foster-care youth, disabled students, economically-disadvantaged youth, and young adults who have graduated high school but may not have career or educational plans. The funding base for in-school youth is WIOA and the Chafee funds can be utilized to support those Independent Living participants who are aging out of foster care. Recommendation one includes continued funding to Dane County School Consortium (DCSC) in the amount of \$128,027.87 to serve 45 In-school youth participants.

Cataldo questioned what items are included in support services. Schramm listed examples such as security deposits, transportation, and uniforms. Roddy inquired if personal protective equipment (PPE) is included. Schramm confirmed. Langer requested cost comparisons to Middle College. Schramm responded with an estimated cost of \$7,000.00 whereas this recommendation has an estimated cost of \$2,000.00, allowing for more than triple the participant count.



Falco inquired on the role of Madison College. Schramm stated their role as career-service based. If students are interested in post-secondary education, Madison College will come in to workshop for career advancement, meeting with them as a group. Lentz added this would help to support increased awareness to the student of perspective options for their future.

Schramm further clarified plans of holding sessions with staff to help students who are applying for financial aid toward their four-year degrees. Larson stated students are able to complete their Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on October 1 annually whereas most students are not aware and apply around April. Public assistance recipients are eligible for additional grants and are on a first-come, first-serve basis. Schramm added honing in on these public assistance resources and getting them to apply for financial aid as early as possible is an important factor in success.

Falco requested confirmation of the ideology these students are being sent to college already prepared. Schramm confirmed. Roddy inquired if funding is affected by any existing savings the student(s) would have accumulated through other ventures such as Youth Apprenticeship. Schramm replied that this is where our Resource Specialists and Independent Living (IL) coaches can engage as part of the team/network to discuss any financial issues or obstacles with the student.

Schramm continued with the logistics behind recommendation two, out-of-school youth, focusing on four specific factors; coordination between the Workforce Development Board staff and Youth Program Manager & team, continued funding of one Youth Career Specialist at \$66,381.00 to serve one-hundred youth through June 30, continued funding for Training Navigators at \$176,697.16 to serve one-hundred and forty-five (145) youth at Madison College, \$3,490.50 to serve two youth at Moraine Park Technical College, and continued funding for Resource Specialists at \$64,204.25 to Operation Fresh Start (OFS), \$21,329.22 to Central Wisconsin Community Action Council (CWCAC), and \$16,120.63 to Community Action Coalition of South Central Wisconsin (CACSCW).

MOTION: Guttenberg asked for a motion to present recommendation one and two to the Full Board on May 15, 2019. White moved to approve the motion as presented. Cataldo offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. Jim Falco and Lisa Pollard abstained.

Falco inquired on the coordination of the various regional staff working with youth. Schramm noted that CWCAC would target their effort toward working with Independent Living youth who are aging out of foster care but may be in-school youth or out-of-school youth. The CWCAC staff intend to be working out of the Baraboo Job Center for the northern region.

Falco proceeded to inquire on where to direct unsolicited youth participants seeking services. Schramm noted that we don't want to have a wrong door for any youth seeking assistance. These participants can be referred to the Resource Specialists, Job Centers, Training Navigators, or be referred to the Workforce Development Board (WDB) who will determine appropriate referral. Guttenberg added the Workforce



Development Board (WDB) should be included in and disseminate information regarding any open-houses or meetings in order to provide staff an on-site experience to help expedite the process.

Lentz shared that the One-Stop Operator convenes the local WDBSCW-contracted service providers to help and support alignment. Larson added the Workforce Development Board (WDB) is aware of youth who are aging out of foster care and the current process of meeting with them once they are sixteen or seventeen years of age. Falco inquired if Madison College has a person designated already for these youth services. Schramm stated these practices apply to out-of-school youth only and Madison College does have several out-of-school youth Training Navigators who can be part of that young person's services plan.

Falco inquired on the possibility to shift staff deployments. Schramm responded it is an option but the staff would need to remain focused on services to the respective geographic regions as we need to maintain and focus on the rural areas. Lentz added that staffing structure is at the discretion of the contracting provider, and should adequately take into account the resource investment and contractually reflect numbers geographically.

Agenda Item 7 – Adjournment

With no additional business for the committee, Guttenberg motioned to adjourn at 10:33 a.m.
Adjourned: 10:33 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Francis Langer
Board Secretary
Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin, Inc.

Attachment for Board Records:

- Agenda
- February 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes – Draft
- PowerPoint Presentation – Youth Committee Agenda, Discussion and Recommendations
- PowerPoint Presentation – Filling the Pipeline

