Maricopa County Workforce Development Board – Quality Workforce Workgroup Meeting Minutes

MCWDB Staff Office
Monday, October 7, 2019 at 2:00pm
701 W Jefferson St., Ste 104, Phoenix, AZ 85007
WebEx: https://mcwdb-1095-9b71.my.webex.com/meet/mcwdb
Phone: +1-510-338-9438; Access Code/Meeting ID: 625 125 871

Members Present: Vanessa Andersen, Mark Wagner, Shawn Hutchinson (Ph.), Tina Luke, Ashley Wilhelm
Members Absent: Steve Yamamori

Call to Order
Quality Workforce Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Andersen called the meeting to order at 2:05pm.

Roll Call – Management Analyst, Isabel Creasman, took roll; a quorum of the workgroup was present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes
Workgroup lead, Ms. Andersen, asked for a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes. Tina Luke made a motion to approve, Mark Wagner seconded the motion. All present were in favor; motion carried.

Targeted Occupations & Related Research
Management Analyst, Isabel Creasman, reviewed the work/topics discussed to date, including actions taken by the workgroup during the previous meeting and follow-up items necessary for further discussions. Dr. Creasman then reviewed the purpose of the meeting.

Approval of Selection Criteria for Target Occupations
Dr. Creasman reviewed the target occupations definition and selection criteria discussed during the September 23, 2019 meeting, which resulted in 83 target occupations. An additional option for selection criteria was proposed based on feedback from the previous meeting, which involved raising the wages threshold from the originally proposed $11.90 to $18.27. This new option led to a list of 70 target occupations. Dr. Creasman reviewed the impact of the changes on the originally proposed target occupations list, which affected the healthcare sector and many entry-level positions (e.g., nursing assistants, medical assistants, customer service representatives); this change would also impact possible future entry level positions from making it on the list. In addition, Dr. Creasman shared that though the originally proposed threshold was $11.90, none of the 83 target occupations had wages this low.
Discussion was held on the selection criteria. All were in agreement for the approval of option 1 (wage threshold of $11.90). Ms. Andersen asked for a motion to approve the option 1 for recommendation to the full board. Tina Luke made a motion. Mark Wagner seconded the motion. All present were in favor, including Shawn Hutchinson on the phone. Motion carried.

Review of Proposal for ETPL Clean-up & Training Program Performance Standards
Dr. Creasman provided introductory information on the eligible training provider list (ETPL). She discussed how the list is used by job seekers; reviewed the state's role in maintaining the list; and reviewed the board's role of maintaining the local area's list and setting performance criteria for training providers. A brief discussion was held on the idea of a possible missing indicator, a job seekers' continuous employment with the same employer. Dr. Creasman then reviewed the goal for this topic and turned the presentation over to the One Stop Operator (OSO) Navigator, Summer Houston. Ms. Houston provided a detailed review of the current ETPL programs, by sector, in the Maricopa County local area. Specifically, Ms. Houston provided the workgroup with an overview of the number of Maricopa County training programs associated with each of the 129 in-demand occupations. Ms. Houston then provided an overview of the ETPL assessment process, which included:

- Reviewing the number of AZ ETPL programs and providers: 1,335 programs; 201 providers.
- Reviewing the number of Maricopa County ETPL programs and providers: 260 programs; 66 providers. Of note, Ms. Houston mentioned that there are only five (5) apprenticeship programs in the local area's list (of the 43 statewide apprenticeship programs available).
- Assessment of the local area ETPL credentials available: Most target industry training programs include industry recognized credentials and college certifications. Only three (3) industries (manufacturing, construction, and transportation) include apprenticeship certifications.
- ETPL performance standards per the state's policy: Ms. Houston reviewed the state's ETPL performance standards and noted that local areas may identify additional measures and/or may propose standards that are higher.
- The OSO's recommendations:
  - Short-term – (1) Update ETPL to include all eligible apprenticeship programs for the local area. (2) Identify programs meeting or exceeding current state performance standards.
  - Mid-term – Form a regional or local workgroup for to clean up the ETPL. Suggestions for ways to clean up the list were also reviewed.
  - Long-term – (1) Create a different interface for customers researching programs on the ETPL to make it easier for customer to navigate and understand the training available in the local area. (2) Annual virtual convening with training providers to understand board's vision, goals, and performance expectations. (3) Methods for providers to access/receive on-time TA to ensure providers know how to manage their programs in the ETPL. (4) Creating a provider database to collect training program data.

- Ms. Houston then reviewed key areas for policy development; tools available for monitoring programs, as well as program credential checklists; and future opportunities for further refinement.

Discussion was then held on this topic with questions on the timeline for completion if the short, mid, and long-term goals presented were to be adopted. Discussion was also held on a need for devoted staff time to focus on ETPL maintenance and TA for providers. The work group then discussed next steps, which included a follow-up meeting in October or November to revisit this topic. The work group would like to know the timeline to complete the OSO's recommendations and understand what is doable in the next few months. Ms. Anderson also noted that the focus of the ETPL should shift to the target occupations.

Review of Proposal for Feedback Surveys
Dr. Creasman provided an overview of the feedback survey proposals and noted that these are being presented because they fulfill initiatives from two work groups: The Quality Workforce Workgroup (Gather information from employers and job seekers to improve workforce system), and the Marketing Workgroup (Better understand customer pain points & the customer experience; Understand how customers learn about the program to improve outreach efforts). The proposals are for employer and job seeker *workforce system* surveys.

Job Seeker Survey
Dr. Creasman reviewed the job seeker survey proposal. The proposal is to develop and administer at a workforce system survey that includes all title partners (Titles: I-IV), which can be used for quality improvement. Dr. Creasman reviewed the surveys needed: (1) during services and (2) after program completion. The challenges of conducting a single workforce system were reviewed and included the fact that all partners currently administer their own feedback surveys and that there is no single database of all job seekers served. Two options were reviewed for conducting the job seeker survey: (1) conduct survey in-house, or (2) contract out survey development and administration. The pros and cons of each

option were reviewed and a recommendation was made to contract this work out to an outside group. The work group then discussed difficulties of survey development and administration. Shawn Hutchinson made a motion to recommend option 2 (contract out job survey development and administration) to the board. Tina Luke seconded the motion. All present were in favor, including Shawn Hutchinson on the phone. Motion carried.

Employer Survey
Business Service Representative, Gabe Cruz, and Business Service Representative (Mesa Office), Marina Quiroz, presented their proposal for workforce system employer surveys. Mr. Cruz noted that currently, business service representatives from the various titles use different databases and have multiple surveys. Other challenges discussed included a need to have a third party distribute the survey to obtain unbiased results and ensuring that the survey is not too lengthy. The employer surveys necessary include (1) an event survey, (2) a feedback survey after 1 month of receiving employer services, and (3) a feedback survey after a job placement. Two options were reviewed for conducting the employer survey: (1) conduct survey in-house, or (2) contract out survey development and administration. The pros and cons of each option were reviewed and a recommendation was made to contract this work out to an outside group. Tina Luke made a motion to recommend option 2 to the board. Shawn Hutchinson seconded the motion. All present were in favor, including Shawn Hutchinson on the phone. Motion carried.

Career Pathways Framework
Dr. Creasman shared a status update on the framework for career pathways development. The framework follows a model from Workforce Alamo, which displays the progression of occupations and color codes them by target occupations, target apprenticeship occupations, in demand occupations, and non-target/in-demand occupations. The visual pathways framework also depicts typical entry level education level, training necessary, and the wage ranges. Dr. Creasman then shared the industry packets, which include an overview of the sector, the visual pathways, and the training programs available for the occupations. The next steps for this work is to develop sector partnerships.

Sector Partnerships Approach
Business Services Team Supervisor, Kevin Dumcum, provided a proposal and update on sector partnerships. Mr. Dumcum began by sharing work that is currently underway to support existing sector partnership initiatives, which include: (1) Greater Phoenix Chamber Foundation- Construction, Cyber Security, Financial Industry, Specialty Nursing; (2) Office of Economic Opportunity- Insurance industry; (3) WESTMARC- Healthcare, Advanced Business Services; and (4) other chambers of commerce. Mr. Dumcum shared that current work to support these existing partnerships involves providing business services support (LMI, knowledge sharing, and connections to employers) and assisting with the rollout of these partnerships by sharing the benefits of these collaborations with other employers and promoting job seekers opportunities.
Mr. Dumcum then shared a proposal to create sector partnerships in areas where there are gaps. To that end, a list of potential employers in each industry sector has been developed. Mr. Dumcum also shared that he completed training in the Talent Pipeline Management model, and he also joined the Talent Pipeline Management National Learning Network. Mr. Dumcum then provided an overview of Talent Pipeline Management (TPM), which is an evidence based model. TPM is employer driven and uses supply chain principles; success is determined by employer ROI. The next steps for the sector partnership approach include the following: (1) continued support of existing partnerships, (2) identifying potential employers to join collaboratives, (3) adopt TPM to convene new employer collaboratives, and (4) prioritize and launch one employer collaborative in 2020.

Action Items/Next Steps
There is one item that will have to be revisited by the Workgroup at a later date:
1. ETPL proposal with timelines

Call to the Public
Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Andersen, called for public comment. No public comment.

Adjourn
Workgroup Lead, Vanessa Anderson, adjourned meeting at 4:18 pm.

For additional information, contact MCWDB Staff, at: mcwdb@maricopa.gov