

## Summary from 7/13/21 Joint Grant Review and Policy Committee Meeting:

### Evaluation discussion:

- Tracking other incentives employers receive from the State.
- Tracking whether program participants receive other trainings from Idaho institutions.
- Tracking credit for prior learning.

### WDTF Grant Concerns:

- Grant award amounts.
  - Large employer grant requests since they impact a single business. ISG are different because they impact an industry.
  - If the employer is not putting money into the project, it can be difficult to want to give them a large sum of money.
- Internal training requests.
- Repeat applicants.
- Consider increasing alignment to training for in-demand occupations.

### Employer Grants:

- Wage
  - The \$12 minimum. Is this too low?
  - The average county wage threshold needs to keep up with the current wage data. (Confirmed with IDOL that they use the most recent – 1 year old)
- Repeat applications:
  - Do we need to add additional metrics to the QFM? A new QFM could be created for repeat applicants.
  - Repeat applicants need to provide more specific outcomes for the offered training. The skills being taught need to be transferrable.
  - If a repeat applicant comes to the WDC, they should share how the previous funds were expended and how the new request is different from previous requests. This will help ensure the training are beneficial to the employees and not just the company.
  - If an employer does not expend the funds of previous grant, then that should affect future grant applications.
  - Integrate the train the trainer focus into employer grants.
  - Limit application of employer grant to every x years.
- Allowable Expenditures:
  - What kinds of training should the WDTF funds be used for (e.g. safety training)?
    - Limit percentage for certain categories?
    - Mechanism to prevent training for non-portable skills.
  - If one employer is receiving funding for safety training, then all employers should receive funding for safety training.
  - Internal Vs. External Training
    - It would be nice to have the QFM give more weight to external training over internal training.
    - Consider limiting internal training to a percent of the total.
    - Consider funding only external training.

- Transferability:
  - Leadership training or other “soft skills” type of training is valuable but so often the training is an event. To measure the success of the training it comes down to the culture and accountability of the business.
  - It is a good investment to provide train the trainer opportunities. One individual can be trained and then come back to the employer and train the rest of the employees. If the WDC could figure out how to implement this statewide it could make a big impact.
  - Other States’ have moved towards a model where if the training does not result in a credential, then the training is not eligible for funding.
    - This could be deployed on repeat customers before deploying it on new grantees.
    - The State could purchase the curriculum for skills training (e.g. leadership, OSHA, etc.) and offer them through Launch. This would allow any Idahoan to access to the training.
  
- Application Questions:
  - How is this training being provided today?
  - Why are WDTF necessary?
  - Increase requirements for providing detail on internal training. (All or just repeat?)
  
- Other:
  - Factor employer contributions to trainings into the QFM.