

Program Review Committee Meeting

WCF Admin Office
707 Mendham Blvd., Suite 250
Orlando, FL 32825
Friday, February 22, 2013
8:30 a.m.

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Sanford Shugart, Dr. Angela Adams (via phone), Greg Beliveau (via phone) Paul Bough, Brian Michaels, Tirso Moreno, and Eric Ushkowitz

MEMBERS ABSENT: Wendy Brandon, Steve Clelland and Richard Sweat

STAFF PRESENT: Pam Nabors, Kevin Neal, Joyce Hinton, Homer Boone, Tonya Elliott, Anika Holmes, Nilda Blanco, Chad Kunerth, and Kaz Kasal

WELCOME & CHAIR'S REMARKS

Welcome

Dr. Shugart called the meeting to order at 8:30 am and welcomed those in attendance.

Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

Ms. Kasal commenced with roll call and established that there was a quorum present.

Public Comment

None offered.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM 1/25/13

Mr. Michaels made a motion to approve minutes from 1/25/13 meeting. Mr. Ushkowitz seconded, motion passed.

REVIEW OF PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Mr. Neal indicated the local Dashboard measures that the Program Committee will be reviewing today are the traditional measures used by the previous board over the past 5 to 6 years. Ms. Nabors added that this Program Committee can determine what changes should be made on these measures. Mr. Neal asked Ms. Blanco and Mr. Kunerth to provide a review of the local Dashboard measures.

Mr. Kunerth provided data highlights and reviewed graphs on the local Dashboard measures, indicating that all figures are based on comparison of the first 6 months of PY 11-12 and PY 12-13. The categories in each data area consisted of: Services to Employers, Services to Job Seekers, Services to Welfare Transition and Services to Re-Employment Connection (REC).

Dr. Shugart suggested that under the "Data Highlights" section, to provide more interpretation – here is the data, what it implies and, based on this, provide an interpretation where the needs/focus should be.

Dr. Shugart suggested that, in regard to measures such as Employer Satisfaction that have zero responses

(no surveys received from employers) in a given month, a bar or histogram format should be used instead of a line graph so as not to imply that a downturn occurred. Month to month comparisons with program activities that are seasonal distorts data – it is better to compare this month compared to same month last year – this will provide a better snapshot. Also put in raw numbers on the data points.

Employer Market Retention – it would be better to measure this by comparing to last year the employers that returned for services this year in an accumulative and stacking format vs. segmented by month.

Dr. Shugart asked the staff, when revising the metrics, to keep in mind the board members' perspective - and present the data in a way that will be most useful to them and more strategic in context – here is activity investment levels and here are the outcomes/impact levels. Also should review/analyze those employers that did not return for services and why.

Mr. Moreno commented that tracking services to determine which services make people more employable is important. Ms. Nabors replied that WCF does review this accumulatively by looking at the overall impact number: of all those on unemployment compensation in this region, how many are receiving WCF's services. The aim is to reduce the unemployment rate and this is reviewed accumulatively vs. one measure. Mr. Beliveau added that the access of all programs as a comprehensive system helps to bolster workforce.

Dr. Shugart advised there are three areas/lenses of focus:

- 1) Customer relations management/customer satisfaction – are we retaining customers and are they using our services more or less intensively?
- 2) Resource allocation and programs – know the spending of funds
- 3) Outcomes and impact, return on investment

With a better explanation/interpretation on local Dashboard measures, will help Program Committee provide more strategic oversight.

Ms. Blanco and Ms. Holmes provided a handout on the 4 R's (Recruitment, Retain, Retrain and ReACT). Ms. Blanco indicated that, at Dr. Shugart's request, staff should provide more supplemental information on the 4 R's, which was provided via handout. Staff has also started the process of reviewing activities and impact.

With regard to job seekers served and placements, Mr. Michaels suggested that staff provide metrics that show the progress/increased percentage of those individuals getting placed by accessing higher quality services – this is important information.

With regard to Job Seeker Satisfaction, Dr. Shugart suggested that staff review and improve survey data collection issues. It is important to expand survey access to beyond resource rooms. Also staff needs to develop a more robust survey model – survey should include a core set of questions, some that are program specific and open response category. Mr. Kunerth added that the current survey does have an open response category, which can be reviewed for trends.

With regard to Welfare Transition, Ms. Nabors stated that the Welfare Participation Rate involves those receiving welfare benefits that are required to be engaged in work activities, and it is this specific population of welfare recipients that WCF serves. It is required that local workforce boards engage at least 50% of this population in work activities. Currently WCF is at 40.2%. Dr. Shugart stated that this information should be part of the local measures. As the economy improves there should be fewer people on welfare, which is already only a small percentage of the population. It is important that WCF actively engage as many of those

individuals required to participate in work activities; however the participation rate should trend downward as the economy recovers. It is important to keep in front of the larger board: number in WT, number that entered employment, characteristics of this population, and how WCF has impacted this population.

With REC program, using layered bars format (instead of line graph) to show first time enrollments, those currently in program, would better depict program activities. Also as this is a time limited program, data should be collected in cohorts – i.e. REC participation group 1 and the specific time period they are in the program. Also measure results after program completion – how many hired by host site, how many hired by outside employer, wage rate, etc.

Mr. Nabors suggested that by moving away from measuring very discreet program activities and identifying total enrolled in programs, total trained, and total placed would provide a larger overall snapshot. Dr. Shugart concurred, he asked staff to rethink the unit of analysis, of time, so that meaningful trends are produced and provide more actionable items. Also staff should work on bringing to the full board an annual performance snapshot of the program year.

Mr. Moreno commented that there are 2 forces occurring: 1) reducing unemployment and 2) finding better quality jobs with higher wages to jobseekers. The latter should have more focus - it is important to find ways to help jobseekers attain better jobs and this will improve their quality of life. Also with immigration reform occurring, our region should be prepared to provide services, including employability skills to this population sector – this is a big opportunity.

Dr. Shugart concurred with Mr. Moreno and commented that at the State level, data loses regional character and there is no one charged at the regional level to further explore, research and monitor the larger workforce issues. Valencia College can partner with the regional workforce board and form an institute to provide focus on: long term challenges, the chronically unemployed, policies, and strengths,

Dr. Shugart thanked the staff on their work with these measures. The refocus on business services has clearly showed up in the metrics. The larger focus will be to delve into the redesign of the dashboard so more actionable items are produced. Staff can present a new draft within 60 to 90 days and also provide an annual report to board at the end of the years showing trends in performance and in context with changes/economy.

The committee concurred that measures need to be revised and redesigned.

Re-Employment Connection (REC):

Ms. Hinton provided an overview of the REC program both historically and currently.

Mr. Beliveau commented that he received a complaint from an individual who was told that they could not work in another county than the one they resided in. Ms. Hinton stated that job matches are usually done within the same county that the participant resides; however they try to accommodate and there have been participants that have worked in another county. Mr. Hinton asked Mr. Beliveau to provide further information on this individual and she will research.

Dr. Shugart asked staff to prepare report to the larger board on REC changes made and impact.

Occupational Training

Dr. Shugart asked staff to defer this to next meeting.

Training Provider Recommendations

The committee reviewed the following training providers which staff is recommending to be approved

- AeroStar Training Services – to provide Type Rating training for pilots
- Aviation Institute of Maintenance – to provide aircraft repair and maintenance training
- Centura Institute – to provide medical assistance and practical nursing training
- Florida Medical Prep – to provide phlebotomy technician, patient care/nursing assistant and practical nursing training

Dr. Shugart confirmed with staff that currently WCF screens training providers to make sure they have appropriate licenses and the entity has been in business long enough, which is in accordance with consumer law.

After further review and discussion, Mr. Beliveau made a motion to bring forward the above 4 training providers to full board for their approval. Mr. Michaels seconded, motion passed.

Dr. Shugart asked staff if they are intending to go further than consumer level when reviewing new training providers. Mr. Neal affirmed and indicated that at the next meeting they will be bringing recommendations to committee on a more involved process of approving training providers.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Nabors indicated that staff is recommending that WCF keep involved with chambers, associations and economic development organizations as part of their business services outreach. There is a budget of \$20,000 for memberships to these types of organizations and this is an allowable activity. Ms. Holmes provided an overview on the cost analysis and the advantages of membership involvement, which would help to increase WCF exposure and connection in the business community, in efforts to increase job openings. This involvement would also help in understanding and staying current on the types of talent businesses are in need of. Ms. Holmes stated that membership activities will be reviewed on an annual basis to determine impact and if it helps the bottom line. Ms. Holmes also noted that the African-American and Hispanic Chambers will be included in the proposed plan for chamber membership participation and that both of these chambers have Presidents who currently serve on WCF's Board of Directors. Ms. Nabors added while not required under the rules to go to board with respect to this, in terms of transparency staff decided it best to provide full disclosure. Dr. Shugart concurred that employer services need to be connected to the business community and commented that it was wise to provide this disclosure to the board. Mr. Ushkowitz asked if this would be the standard membership for non-profits? Ms. Holmes replied yes.

CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING REMARKS

Dr. Shugart thanked the efforts of the WCF staff and committee.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next committee meeting will occur on March 29, 2013 at WCF Admin office.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 10:12 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaz Kasal

Sr. Administrative Assistant