

**Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin, Inc.  
Combined Planning and Development Committee & Youth Committee Meeting**

**Ed Clarke, Chair; Kathy Cromey, Co-Chair; Pam Christenson, Marcia Christiansen, Kathy Collins, Paul Dietmann, Nancy Elsing, Fred Hebert, Lindsay Jones, Bob Kellerman, Barb LeDuc, Steve Lewis, Jim Martinez, Ann McNeary, Les Mirkin, Bill Orth, Mary Pasholk, Dave Phillips, Lynn Severson, Howard Teeter, Clay Tschillard, Terry Webb**

**Randy Guttenberg, Chair; Laura Cataldo, Kathy Cromey, Alex Fralin, Rich Hands, Matt Hurtienne, John Lalor, Brian Pulford, Diana Shinall**

**Tuesday, May 12, 2015  
8:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.**

**Madison College  
1701 Wright Street, Madison  
Administration Building 122-130**

**Members Present:** Ed Clarke, Dave Phillips, Bill Orth, Rich Hands, Marcia Christiansen, Nancy Elsing, Kathy Cromey, John Lalor, Ann McNeary, Mary Pasholk, Lindsay Jones, Randy Guttenberg, Les Mirkin, Laura Cataldo

**Staff Present:** Pat Schramm, Seth Lentz, Danica Nilsestuen, Jackie Hall, Tia Rice, Erin Bechen

**Agenda Item 1 – Welcome & Introductions**

Guttenberg and Clarke welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Clarke reviewed the mission of the Planning and Development Committee. Lentz noted that the combined meeting is due to the fact that we are in a time of transition. The Planning and Development Committee is targeted to providing services to adults, dislocated workers, continuing out-of-school youth and incumbent workers under Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). The Youth Committee is targeted to provide services to Out-of-School Youth and Middle College.

**Agenda Item 2 – Review and Approval of the March 18, 2015 Planning and Development Committee Meeting Minutes**

Clarke asked for review and discussion of the minutes of the March 18, 2015 Planning and Development Committee meeting. He recommended language reflected under agenda item 3 be changed to more accurately reflect the conversation and intent of the Committee's discussion. Specifically, that the sub-title for Strategy 5 be restated to reflect the intent to manage program engagement and performance. Secondly that the second paragraph under strategy 5. He shared that the last sentence – work with contractors on collecting non-positive exits, and he suggests 'work with contractors to not collect non-positive exits, but exit individuals throughout the year as appropriate'.

Clarke noted that he recalled the discussion regarding the 219 cases in question, this portion of the minutes could be amended to reflect that, these cases may contribute positively toward performance. And that the contractors need to take steps to exhaust options to re-engage individuals who may be in need of additional assistance. The goal of these efforts is to provide the best services possible and not intended to distort performance impacts by retaining non-positive cases.

**MOTION:** Elsing made a motion to approve the minutes with the discussed changes. McNeary offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

### **Agenda Item 3 – 2015 One Stop System Contracting Discussion and Recommendation**

Lentz directed members to the PowerPoint presentation on the One Stop System recommendation.

Lentz shared that the Industry clusters are validated by Labor Market Information (LMI) and the Board drives business partners to engage. Sector partnerships are where the industry engagement happens. Sector partnerships impact and influence the career pathway system.

Clarke referenced the recent WIOA training and how our current sector partnerships and career pathways fits in with direction of WIOA.

Jones asked for clarification on what WIOA is. Schramm explained WIOA is replacing WIA and the new legislation has a heavy emphasis on sector partnerships. The full implementation is slated for July 2016. WIOA preparation has prompted changes in staffing design and will be impacting our procurement process. As a result, the Board will likely have system changes in place for the next procurement. There is an increased focus on outcome performance measures as well as a youth financial strategy shift.

Lentz shared information regarding performance metric changes under WIOA. Examples of new measures included, credentials attained will be added as a performance measure. The progress performance goal is to be measured by an individual's progress to a career and/or employment goals. Employer feedback measure will be added back in as a performance measure. Additionally, there are more financial impacts than under WIA for non-performance that under WIA.

In regards to the youth financial strategy, there is a significant shift which includes an increased focus on out of school youth. This will impact the recommendation for in school youth.

Clarke stated that because 75% of youth money will need to go to out of school, the Planning and Development Committee will need to pay closer attention to youth recommendations (previous focus was on middle college which was small number served).

Jones asked for clarification on out of school youth. Schramm clarified that this includes young people, age 18-24 that are not attached to a school.

Lalor asked about youth that are home schooled (high numbers in rural areas), how does this fit? Schramm stated that under compulsory education, home school students are considered students, attached to school. Schramm noted that the Board staff have been pushing our Federal reps that compulsory education states include very small numbers considered out of school youth when you think about drop outs or truants. We are trying to broaden the definition to at least include truants.

Lentz shared that the program has experienced some challenges that have impacted productivity. Staff transitions were expected for some staff as we knew some wouldn't be a good fit for the new model and would find other work

Long term case cleanup – 209 called back from contractors and now Michael is working with partner agencies to evaluate. The goal would be to try to find these individuals and reconnect. Clarke mentioned at last meeting that this strategy will likely not be completed by the end of this fiscal year. Lentz shared that we will continue to update the Board on our progress.

Phillips asked if the 209 people just dropped off our radar. Lentz stated that during evaluation of caseloads, there were a significant volume of people (400ish) in our program for 24 months or longer. We needed to figure out why they are still there; some in training, some could be exited. Found 219 we haven't gotten response from and don't have active contact information for. If we really can't find them, we will slowly exit them from the program.

Schramm stated that under the new legislation, states are making agreements to look at Unemployment Insurance (UI) data across state borders which could help us find some lost cases. We will be able to look after July 1, 2015.

Lentz shared that guidance has been provided to staff – clean up first as we don't want to hang onto cases longer than necessary. Then we can look at why such a large number stayed in system such a long time. The WDB staff will continue to work with our contractors on strategies and best practices to not repeat this situation.

Lentz then reviewed additional information which was considered when framing the contract recommendation for the upcoming year.

***Program Volume***

- Adjusting planned numbers to be served based on the actual volumes being served
- Adjusting the active caseload size expectations down based on high need populations
- Contractors would be expected to maintain an active caseload size of approximately 50
  - Goal to enroll additional participants equal to 50% of the active case load
  - Goal to exit/place participants equal to 50% of the active caseload
  - Goals will vary for the Colleges as their participant are in long term training
- Program volume will primarily be Adult and Dislocated Workers with few Out-of-School Youth

Jones asked if we actually had reached the goal of 800 enrollments, would the active participant number be higher. Lentz stated that yes, we have struggled with contractors pushing higher enrollment numbers; they have focused on one number and we want them focused on the exit number to avoid having a repeat of lost customers.

Lentz also shared that we seem to be experiencing a higher need population with more barriers, which was also a factor in modifying numbers. Half the volume is coming in, half going out.

Clarke stated that this is a big change. System service level expectations of 800/800/800 were high, probably for a couple of reasons: 1) number of people in system looked higher than it really was, 2) as we have begun to work with populations this year, fewer dislocated workers who are more prepared to get into the workforce, many more long term unemployed, adults needing more help and are in the system longer. So we don't want caseload to be as big as we originally thought, as participants will need more assistance.

Lentz noted that contracted staff are trying to be more conservative this year; we will see if we can get success with the numbers we have. Our expectations weren't matching up with 'real world.'

Hands asked what the average length of time someone is on the 'active' caseload is. Lentz stated that it is hard to say because large long term caseloads skew those results. Michael is working to run a report by contractor by type of participant/program.

Schramm shared that what triggered this was the state gave us a report that showed us flow of caseloads which was disproportionate to the state in long term, but with 12-24 month we were right on pace with rest of state, only off with 24+ months.

Lentz noted that the contract amounts reflect pairing down volumes that we are preparing to serve and increasing contract dollar amounts. We need to be realistic and provide quality services to get participants exited to employment.

Pasholk asked what is existing funding to staff. Lentz stated that there are 14.5 staff. There are additional resources and possible increase to staffing.

Clarke acknowledged that "the ask" is counter intuitive in that there are less served and more money. He reminded the Committee to think about the rationale and that we want customers to be served at a higher level to avoid lost cases.

Jones asked if there is a per person dollar amount assigned. Does everyone get the same amount? Limits per person? Lentz stated that to drive the contract amounts, we use a consistent cost per. However, contract reimbursements aren't based on people served.

Lentz noted that there is carryover funds because we didn't utilize all of our strategies – OJT, work experience, training dollars. Expectation is we will utilize them this program year, so cost per person may go up as we utilize more strategies. He also added, that next year is a procurement year and this will be the opportunity for contractors to demonstrate that they can be successful with these additional funds? This can assist them in establishing the demonstrated effectiveness as a contractor and show their ability to do the work.

**Recommendation #1 – Contract Renewal for 2015-2016**

Clarke reported that we would like to renew contracts for 2015-2016 at the proposed funding levels:

Agency	2015-2016 Recommendation	Target Active Caseload (*Slots)	New Enrollment	Exits
<b>EATA</b>	<b>\$607,500</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>202</b>
Dane	\$343,500	229	114	115
North	\$264,000	176	88	88
<b>Opportunities Inc.</b>	<b>\$427,500</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>142</b>
Dane	\$226,500	151	75	76
East	\$201,000	134	67	67
<b>Latino Academy</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>Urban League</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Madison College</b>	<b>\$187,500</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Moraine Park</b>	<b>\$28,500</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,431,000</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>424</b>

Mirkin asked if there is a specific dollar amount calculated per participant that is used to calculate contractor amounts. Schramm stated yes, \$1,500/person at 50 person caseload.

Mirkin stated that if you divide the total number to serve vs. recommended total amount, this comes to 1040, not 1500. Schramm shared that we started with 1500 and we had to do some adjustments to keep financial integrity. The Latino Academy, Urban League, Moraine Park Technical College and Madison College didn't follow 50/1500 as the new contractors had slower starts.

Phillips asked about the cost variance by contractor. Schramm shared that we need to look at scale. Newer contractors did not have a core number in place at beginning of contract, need to ramp them up.

**MOTION:** Clarke asked for a motion to approve the contract renewal recommendation for 2015-2016 as presented. Teeter made a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Elsing offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. Jones abstained from the motion.

Phillips stated that in the future, he would feel more comfortable if we broke down the recommendation by individual contract and cost per individual. He wants to know more about why there are differences; it is hard to understand why it's this amount for this contract and another amount for another contract.

Jones noted a change of 284 under Opportunities, Inc. to 285.

Clarke provided an overview of the various placement strategies which can be used by contractors and the associated budget amounts within the WDB program planning budget. The strategies included Career Pathways Trainings, Long-Term Technical Skills Trainings, Work Experience, On the Job Training and Supportive Services. Schramm noted that work experience becomes a major strategy; it impacts staff time as it is a staff intensive strategy and it will impact Board money.

**Recommendation #2 - Rapid Response**

Lentz stated that the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) is allocating funds to each WDB each year to deal with organizing affected workers and providing orientations and enrollment. We're unsure of the amount at this time. Requests can still be made to DWD for additional assistance as long as local funds are meeting established expenditure levels

He noted that we have a significant amount of activity in the Jefferson County area (McCain, Hamlin/Littlefuse and Eaton) impacting approximately 450 workers in the next 8 month. Based on this level of activity we anticipate being able to request Rapid Response funds.

The recommendation is to contract with Opportunities, Inc. for up to \$112,500 to serve an additional 150 workers. Contract would be pending the available resources and adequate dislocation activity levels.

Clarke asked if we have 450 workers being affected but are only contracting for staff to serve 150, will be equipped to handle the overflow? Lentz stated that if we actually engage significant volume, we can ask for additional resources from state. The State has just changed how we access the funds. Clarke shared that permission for any future funding would go through Executive Committee then through Full Board.

**MOTION:** Clarke asked for a motion to approve giving Board staff permission to contract with Opportunities, Inc. for up to \$112,500 to serve an additional 150 workers. Contract would be pending the available resources and adequate dislocation activity levels. Phillips made a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. McNeary offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. Jones abstained from the motion.

Clarke asked for a motion to adjourn the Planning and Development portion of the meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Adjournment**

Meeting Adjourned at 9:57 a.m.

Clarke transitioned the meeting to the Youth Committee. Schramm stated again that as we transition from WIA to WIOA we may have a need to more combined meetings in the future.

#### **Youth Committee**

##### **Agenda Item 1 – Review and Approval of the January 15, 2015 Youth Committee Meeting Minutes**

Guttenberg asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2015 Youth Committee meeting as presented. Lalor moved to approve the minutes as presented. Hands offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

##### **Agenda Item 2 – 2015 Middle College Contracting Discussion and Recommendation**

Lentz shared that under WIOA, 75% of funds need to be spent on Out of School Youth who are not attending school. This is an increase from 30% under WIA. There is also an increased focus on resources towards students who are graduating from high school without a career focus and high school dropouts.

##### **Out of School Youth Strategies**

Lentz reported on the current strategies, contracts and associated budgets to support our regional out-of-school youth program. Some of these strategies are new and some are strategies we've had. They included career academies, bridge programming, work experience and on-the-job training.

Clarke asked who will recruit students to participate in these activities. Schramm stated that one feeder will be the high schools. Also people in HSED and GED programs. There will also be people

from the general public who come into the Job Centers. The age expands up to age 24. Drop outs are also part of this population. The schools are being very aggressive in engaging the drop outs.

Clarke asked how many we expect to serve. Schramm shared that a guess would be a couple hundred people but we really don't know at this point. There are a lot of people in this space – truants, drop outs, people working on HSED and GED programming.

Schramm shared that we were really planning to use the summer after their senior years to do boot camps and work experience so we can engage students right away. She said that as people think about stackable credentials and short term training, there isn't a difference from our Middle College students so there may be opportunities to align and expand cohorts with those students so there are more training opportunities.

Schramm noted that if you are in a high school HSED program, you are eligible for these funds. For the first time, we will have enough financial funding to blend students together in a training cohort.

Cataldo asked about WIOA percentages and she asked if the total amount of youth allocated changed? Schramm shared that we haven't seen the final allocations but the youth should increase about 2% but the majority was just allocated differently.

Mirkin asked staff to describe the difference between work experience and on the job training. Schramm shared that work experience is where the participant is fully funded by the Board. The goal is to get the participant experience. OJT is where the participant is funded by the company and it is expected that the company would hire the person. We reimburse the company a certain percentage. The length of time for both efforts is flexible.

### **Recommendation #3 – Out of School Youth Services**

Guttenberg stated that recommendation #3 involves contracting with Madison College and Moraine Park to develop strategies and offerings to combine the stackable credential elements to engage out-of-school youth. Lentz reviewed the budget items.

Budget Items	Total
<b>Madison College</b> Career Academies and Bridge Programming	\$280,000
<b>Madison College</b> Training Navigator Out of School Youth	\$100,000
<b>Moraine Park Technical</b> Career Academies and Bridge Programming	\$30,000

**MOTION:** Guttenberg asked for a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Cataldo made a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Hands offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

### **2015-2016 Transition Strategy for In-School Youth (Middle College)**

Lentz shared that the focus is on continuing M5 students. There are no plans to start a new cohort (Junior) until September 2016. We will also focus future efforts on serving high school seniors and building a model for 2016 that blends Middle College and Out-of-School youth career academies into one body of work.

Schramm shared that with all the changes with all the academic changes in high schools, found that students are having a hard time leaving high school as juniors for Middle College. High schools are being more deliberate in helping students think about career pathways. We want to identify with the high schools some courses that students can get into that would be a good transition into the Middle College program. This would be a more deliberate strategy. Guttenberg stated that we need to include the CTE Coordinators.

Schramm shared that DVR also has a focus on in school youth with the new WIOA so we will work more in depth with special education staff.

Clarke asked how many college credits are being lost with students not starting until senior year. Schramm stated that it was only one semester and it was about 8 credits. We will work with the college to see if we can get credits to be dual credit for those high school courses.

**Recommendation #4 – In School Youth / Middle College Contract Recommendation**

Lentz stated that the reduction in numbers is due to the fact that this only includes M5. Schramm stated that the graduates will be transferred over to the WorkSmart program (adult system contractors) for continued engagement or exited from the program as appropriate. We are not starting a new junior cohort but we will have senior continue on.

Position	Agency	2015-2016 Recommendation	2015-2016 No. to serve
<b>Employment Specialists*</b>	DCSC	\$68,000	34
	EATA	\$18,000	9
	Opportunities Inc.	\$24,000	12
	Moraine Park	\$16,000	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$126,000</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Instruction</b>	Madison College	\$303,600	55
	Moraine Park	\$33,768	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$337,368</b>	<b>63</b>

**MOTION:** Gutenberg asked for a motion to approve the renewal of In School Youth/Middle College Contracts for 2015-2016 as presented. Cataldo moved to approve the recommendation as presented. Pulford offered the second. No discussion followed on this motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Agenda Item 3 – Update on Youth Apprenticeship (YA) and DVR Youth Collaborative**

Schramm shared that we are talking more and more about supporting YA program with the Business Services teams who are out in the field so there is discussion with employers about youth in the work place. The goal is to have YA become more and more embedded into the system.



Schramm shared we are working with DVR as more than 50% of Middle College students have learning disabilities. The big picture is to get students ready for employment so the post-secondary costs don't kick in. We also want to manage disabilities in the workplace. There are multiple stages with DVR, Opp Inc., Middle College and YA. DVR pre-transition services are a great tool. MMSD alone has over 1,000 students with disabilities (physical and learning). In addition, so many of these students are disadvantaged.

#### **Agenda Item 4 - Adjournment**

With no additional business for the Committee, Guttenberg moved to adjourn at 10:40 a.m. Committee adjourned.

Adjourned: 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Laura Cataldo  
Board Secretary  
Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin, Inc.

THIS IS AN OPEN MEETING AND WILL BE HELD IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, ORDINANCES, AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO OPEN MEETINGS.

Anyone attending this meeting who requires an interpreter, materials in an alternate format, or other accommodations to access this meeting are asked to contact the Workforce Development Board of South Central Wisconsin office at (608) 249-9001 in advance of the meeting so that arrangements may be made. The meeting location is accessible by ADA standards.

Attachments for Committee Members Only:

- March 18, 2015 Planning and Development Committee Meeting Minutes
- January 15, 2015 Youth Committee Meeting Minutes

cc: Joe Parisi, Executive, Dane County  
Andy Ross, Columbia County Board LEO Representative  
Jim Schroeder, Jefferson County Board  
Russell Kottke, Chair, Dodge County Board  
Bob Miller, Chair, Marquette County Board  
Marty Krueger, Chair, Sauk County Board  
Mike Staude, Department of Workforce Development  
Workforce Development Board Contractors  
Wisconsin State Journal (Public Notice)