

## MTEC Meeting Minutes

June 1, 2000

Full Council Meeting

Marriott Downtown Pavilion, St. Louis

Chair Patti Penny opened the meeting at 8:00 am with a welcome and introduction of Council members, staff and guests. She introduced Council newcomer, Elaine West. Elaine is Director for the Missouri Association for Community Action, located in Jefferson City. Patti next called for changes to the agenda. There were no changes, and the agenda stood as submitted. Patti then called for additions or corrections to the minutes. There were no additions or corrections, so the minutes stood as submitted. Patti made a brief statement regarding an announcement made at the Department of Labor Heartland Conference by Lenita Jacobs-Simmons about the states' policies of provision of services and the option that WIBs can in fact be the administrative function as well as operate programs. Ms. Jacobs-Simmons also indicated the final WIA regulations would be available in July of 2000. This, in essence, reversed the position DOL had taken upon passage of the Workforce Investment Act. However, DOL also stated that states could be more restrictive in this respect. Patti went on to state that MTEC will stand firm in its decision to separate the administrative and operating functions to improve the state's employment and training services and the ability to meet the needs of job seekers and employers. Nick Nichols attended the particular workshop and reaffirmed the Council's policy that the policy-making and oversight function should be independent of the administration and delivery aspect of programs.

Patti then asked Bob Wilson, DOL, to speak to the issue of board certification and the implications of funding. DOL has indicated the critical components that are required to be in place for approval of local plans are:

1. LWIBs must be in place for the designated areas,
2. One-Stop Operators must be designated and
3. the MOU for the area must be in place.

Roger Baugher then began summary of each of the local plans for review and recommendation for approval. Patti reiterated to the Council the conflict of interest policy, which requires members to refrain from having the appearance of impropriety in discussion and voting matters of local plans if they have a direct role in or on the local workforce investment boards or local planning processes in each area. Joe Driskill stated it was the responsibility of the individual to discern his or her impropriety, specifically if he or she stood to benefit from any decision surrounding the plan.

Roger Baugher then continued discussion of local plans by explaining the process of staff review. State staff from various agencies and various areas of expertise comprised the 15 member team which determined areas of questionable compliance, non-compliance and areas needing clarification in terms of requirements under the Workforce Investment Act for each local plan, as well as compliance with MTEC policy decisions under these guidelines. The first plan summary presented for approval was that of the Northwest Region (Attachment I).

Motion was made to approve the plan and was then seconded. Discussion occurred surrounding specific WIB staff who will be accountable, how they are paid and whether they will be responsible for sharing information from the board with MTEC. Additional discussion regarding the Consortium comprised as the One-Stop Operator reaffirmed that Council policy that the One-Stop Operator is accountable to the local WIBs, and would therefore be responsible to MTEC. Patti called for the question. The motion passed, with Fran Brothers abstaining.

The next plan submitted for Council review was the Central Region local plan summary (Attachment 2). Jim Dickerson and Fran Brothers indicated abstention from voting and discussion of the plan from their area. Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan and allow for discussion. Joe Driskill asked for clarification of how the WIB staffing will be arranged. Roger indicated the staffing will serve the administrative functions of the boards. Virginia Mee asked clarification of how the COPIC organization planned to remain independent in each function. Roger explained the process as it existed under JTPA, and how a separate entity exists now as part of a split organizational structure, with definite responsible staff in each organization. The process of selection for providers was addressed and how the information was disclosed. Steve Kraus mentioned three ways the law allowed One-Stops to be designated. These include: 1) competitive process, 2) consortium of three of the organizations with the chief elected official and WIB approval (excepting the Youth provider), and 3) other means that are not relevant to the initial selection because it covers grandfathering the board. Patti called for the question. The motion passed with Fran Brothers and Jim Dickerson abstaining.

The St. Louis City Region local plan summary was presented next (Attachment 3). Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan and allow for discussion. Clarifications regarding the fiscal agent and staffing to the board were addressed, as well as suggestion that deadlines be set for specifying board staff. George Eberle questioned what process was followed to ensure regional compliance. Tom Jones stated the Executive Committee Conference call discussion that occurred on April 24 determined that the plan did, in fact, meet the three requirements as outlined by the Council for regional plans. George recalled the discussion and determined that the three requirements had to be met, not necessarily that the particular plan had done so. Fran Brothers stated her understanding was that of Tom's, which was that the plan after discussion did not need to go back to the Special Focus Committee. Fran Brothers moved an amendment that all plans meeting the three criteria as set forth by the Regional Planning Committee do not have to be returned to the Special Focus Committee for approval. The motion to amend was seconded and passed. The motion then passed unanimously.

The Ozark Region plan summary was presented (Attachment 4), and motion was made and seconded to approve the plan. Discussion followed regarding concern for intern staffing of the board, specifically due to temporary structure of intern employment and limited immediate knowledge of issues. Clarification that the WIB staffing would be overseen by the Coordinator of the Springfield Mayor's Commission on Human Rights, and that position would ultimately be accountable. Joe Driskill requested that the record reflect that the Council understands all WIB staff will be operational July 1. The question was called, and

the motion passed unanimously.

The St. Charles County Region local plan summary was then presented (Attachment 5). Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan, and discussion followed. Much discussion occurred surrounding the intent of MTEC's policy regarding provision of services, and whether the plan met that intent. Roger explained that although the designated entity for both the WIB staff and the One-Stop Operator was the same, the entity would not be paid out of WIA funds, and that this separation was in compliance with MTEC policy. Patti called for the question, and the motion passed with Dr. Wayne Giles, Rick Hendin and George Eberle abstaining.

Next on the agenda was a presentation by East-West Gateway and the Regional Commerce and Growth Association that addressed the regional planning needs and components in the St. Louis area. Les Sterman and Dick Fleming with the respective groups explained how the consortium will relate to the WIBs to coordinate regional efforts in Workforce Development. They addressed the mission, the outcomes, and the goals of the regional workforce development planning system. The two groups, though previously at discord on the effort, have developed a strategy to focus on the customer, rather than isolated areas of the various regions, to arrive at a collaborative framework. The scope of the regional planning effort goes beyond even the WIA and requires mobilization of all efforts and resources, not solely those of workforce development.

Following the presentation, Roger explained the next series of plans that were not ready for complete approval, but a process for future approval was needed. The Kansas City and Vicinity Region local plan summary was reviewed first (Attachment 6). Dr. Wayne Giles stated his intent to refrain from discussion and voting on the particular plan. Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan subject to Governor's certification of the board. Discussion regarding program oversight followed. Roger clarified that the oversight will be provided by a separate entity that does not provide Title I services.

The East Jackson County Region local plan was then summarized (Attachment 7). Roger indicated that the region had submitted a request for WIB certification and the request was under review. Alise Martiny-Byrd and Dr. Wayne Giles announced their intent to abstain from voting and discussion of the plan. Discussion regarding clarification of Regional Planning issues followed. Patti called for the question, and the motion passed with Alise Martiny-Byrd, Yvonne Sparks-Strauther, and Dr. Wayne Giles abstaining.

Following a break for lunch, motion was made and seconded to reconsider the vote for approval of the St. Charles County plan. The motion passed with Milt Bischof abstaining. Clarification was requested regarding the One-Stop Operator and whether the designation of Marvin Freeman went against MTEC policy on the division of the administrative and service functions. Roger stated that the division's interpretation was that the designation did not violate MTEC policy based on the fact that the One-Stop Operator would not be paid with WIA funds. After further discussion surrounding the intent of the policy, motion was made and seconded to table the issue until other plans were approved. The motion passed.

The next local plan summary presented was for the West Central Region (Attachment 8).

Roger presented elements of the plan, and indicated that certification of the local board, clarification of the single point of employer contact and the labor market information are still required in the plan. Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan contingent upon Governor's Certification of the board and the two outstanding issues being rectified. The motion passed with Jim Jackson abstaining.

The Southwest Region local plan summary followed (Attachment 9). Concern for specific roles of the PIC and the WIB was discussed, and whether the plan as submitted was in compliance with MTEC policy. Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan contingent upon clarification of the WIB issue and Governor Certification of the Board. The motion passed.

Roger then presented the Southeast Region local plan summary (Attachment 10). Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan contingent that the required MOU is in compliance with MTEC policy. The motion passed. Further discussion of the MOU followed.

The next plan summary presented was the St. Louis County Region (Attachment 11). Roger stated additional information was needed, including: additional labor market information, certain youth plan elements, definition of the sixth youth eligibility criterion and clarification of single point of employer contact. Motion was made and seconded to adopt the plan contingent upon clarification of indicated issues and compliant MOUs are put into place. The motion passed with Rick Hendin abstaining.

The final plan presented for approval was for the Northeast Region (Attachment 12). Roger indicated the plan was awaiting Governor certification of the local board and, in addition, required the following information: One-Stop Operator yet to be identified, MOUs in place, policy compliant with the state's policy and clarification of labor market information. Motion was made and seconded to approve the plan contingent upon compliance with above issues. The motion passed.

Motion was then made and seconded to remove from the table the earlier motion regarding the St. Charles County plan. The motion passed. Excerpts from the October 1999 minutes were distributed to Council members to clarify the nature and intent of the delivery of service policy. Motion was made and seconded to move approval of the plan to the Executive Committee for further discussion on the issue via conference call on or around June 15, 2000. All MTEC members will be notified of the location and time of the call and invited to participate. The record should reflect that the issue to be resolved is whether SDA 14 plans to meet the intent of MTEC policy regarding Workforce Investment Boards operating core and intensive services.

Joe Driskill then offered an amendment to MTEC's existing policy in the form of a motion on local plan reviews and approvals. Each plan approval communicated to Local Workforce Investment Boards will include a statement of what changes in local plans, which exist as contracts between the WIB and MTEC, will necessitate a notification to MTEC. Those changes will include, but may not be limited to the following:

1. Board Staffing charges
2. One Stop Operator Changes
3. MOU changes
4. Changes in local WIB certification

Further, any changes to local plans that require notification to MTEC shall be communicated to MTEC and its staff within 30 calendar days after changes are made.

Failure to follow the terms of the local plans and notification of changes to local plans, may result in a change of funding to the WIB.

Motion was seconded to approve the amendment. The amendment passed.

Jim Dickerson then reported for the Marketing Committee on the issue of the Workforce Development System Logo. He moved the Council approve the logo "Missouri Career Center-Where Jobs and Opportunities Meet." The motion was seconded and passed. The official graphics of the logo and tag line will be distributed to all MTEC members as soon as it is decided upon.

Fred Grayson reported for the Evaluation and Awards Committee. He mentioned that the Committee agreed to remain with the Governor's Conference Award Criteria from the previous year, with the addition of one award that would be presented to one outstanding WIB. The other five categories were, and will remain: leadership, customer focus and satisfaction, innovation, collaboration/integration, and private sector participation in the workforce development system. Motion was made and seconded to approve the award categories. The motion passed. He then reported on the UMC Research Contract and moved that the Council allow the University to continue with research of the four Governor's questions, but ask the same four questions of each of the programs. These programs include Employment Security, JTPA, FUTURES and Vocational Rehabilitation. Additionally, a second research tool would include the return-on-investment of each activity undertaken by participants within the program. The motion was seconded. Discussion surrounding clarification of program analysis followed. Fran Brothers stated it was her understanding that the Council wanted to avoid the appearance of comparing programs that might lead to competition among them. Mike Pulliam stated that in order to do the return-on-investment, the research data was needed. He stated the research has always measured programs separately, because we are given data by program, but it takes it a step further to complete the return-on-investment model to determine the amount of impact the programs are having. The motion passed.

Patti Penny then mentioned that Mike Pulliam, MTEC Staff Director, has accepted a new position elsewhere within the Division and that Rick Beasley has been appointed to the position. She wished both Mike and Rick well in their new endeavors.

Joe Driskill mentioned an item for New Business surrounding an approach to MTEC joint staffing with partner agencies. He mentioned that an item for the next agenda should include this topic. This type of coordination has not been possible in the past, but must now be pursued and begin to ask state agency staff how it might be accomplished.

Patti then called for Public Comment. Don Eisinger with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education questioned how the new logo, "Missouri Career Center" might conflict with the various technical schools in the state and if any confusion is expected regarding those persons seeking education and training and those persons seeking employment. Jim Dickerson stated that in many cases, the education and training aspect ought to be an affiliate site of the workforce development offices, and that it can only further universalize the direction of the system.

Clyde McQueen then commented that this was the last MTEC meeting under the JTPA system. He furthered mention that the mission of the new programs is to help people and the challenge is to the staff and the boards to make this happen.

The meeting was adjourned following public comment.

## MISSOURI TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT COUNCIL

June 1, 2000

Marriott Downtown Pavilion

St. Louis, Missouri

### ATTENDEES

#### MEMBERS:

Fran Brothers, John Dial, Jim Dickerson, Dr. Wayne Giles, Fred Grayson, Jim Jackson, Herb Johnson, Alise Martiny-Byrd, Virginia Mee, Nick Nichols, Patti Penny, Chair, Yvonne Sparks-Strauther, Elaine West, Jackie Wood for Catherine Leapheart, Ron Vessell, Joe Driskill, George Eberle, Milt Bischof, Mikki Brewster, Rick Hendin.

#### STAFF AND GUESTS:

David Mitchem, Tom Jones, Mike Pulliam, Don Holt, Saralinda Viggers, Roxi Stiles, Betty Trimble, Kay Monks, Steve Kraus, Bob Simpson, Geraldine Wasniewski, Diana Very, John Cope, Bev Kelsay, Lindell Thurman, Al Carter, Bob Wilson, Ron Jewell, Don Eisinger, Judy Eggen, Amy Davis, Mark Mehmert, Clinton Flowers, Tony Hiesberger, Neal Ball, Mike Shepard, Clyde McQueen, Bob Hall, Rex Hall, Marvin Freeman, Amy Deem, Rick Beasley, Sondra Larsen, Blair Forlaw, Bill McKittrick, Ron Swift, Jane Boyle, Glenn Stinson, Tim O'Dea, Mark Bauer, Beverly McCabe, Sharon LeGrand, David Wright.