



## WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

317 West Main Street, Boise, Idaho 83735-0510

### Workforce Development Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date:** Tuesday, December 18, 2018  
**Time:** 10:00 am – 11:00 am (Mountain Time)  
**Location:** Teleconference  
Call In: 1-720-279-0026  
Guest Passcode: 470642

**Meeting Conducted By:** B.J. Swanson, Committee Chairman

**Council Members:** B.J. Swanson, Joe Maloney, John Smith, Kelly Kolb, Lori Wolff, Scott Syme, Todd Schwarz

**Committee Members:** Christi Rood, Jake Reynolds, Roy Valdez, Marie Price

**Guests:** Craig Shaul

**Staff:** Wendi Secrist, Matthew Thomsen, Paige Nielebeck, William Burt

**Call to Order at 10:00 AM**

**Roll Call** – no quorum

**Review Agenda** - no additions to the agenda.

Approval of minutes will be moved to the end of the agenda to see if a quorum can be met.

**\*Approve Minutes from June 19 and November 20, 2018 Meetings**

This item has been moved to the next meeting.

#### **In-Demand Occupations**

Craig Shaul from the Idaho Department of Labor presented on In-Demand Occupations tool that has been developed for the Council and other stakeholders. Please see attached presentation.

We need an In-Demand Occupations list for the ETP Policy. In order to be put on the ETP List, an entity has to be providing training for occupations that are in high demand. This data is filterable by region which is beneficial because different occupations are in demand in different regions.

The goal is to have this live by the end of January. Mr. Shaul will be providing the WDC Staff members with access to the beta site prior to the January council meeting so they can explore the site.



## WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

317 West Main Street, Boise, Idaho 83735-0510

### WDTF Scoring Matrix

At the last meeting the committee discussed making changes to the Quantitative Funding Model. The changes to the WDTF Policy require some change to the funding model and stipulate that the committee will review/update it annually.

Ms. Secrist went over the changes made to the draft matrix and the county average wage sheet. Please see attached documents.

Would having a midpoint between \$12 an hour and the county average wage be a positive or negative impact on the model?

- As long as we are consistent it should not cause any issues. It comes back to what the objectives are of the Workforce Development Training Fund. The main objective is to make sure that Idahoans are prepared for high-wage, in-demand careers.
- The gap between \$12 an hour and county average wage, on occasion, could be an issue – especially for registered apprenticeship where the employees are starting at a lower wage.
- A few of the recent grants were run through the new methodology and some of the grant scores increased and others decreased.
- In most instances the difference between the \$12 an hour and the county average wage is small. Higher wages show the return on investment we are receiving. If we are giving these companies funds we expect there to be a return on investment in their community.

The Committee would like to use the draft model that does not use a midpoint between the county average wage and \$12 an hour. They would also like to separate the wages and education and training pieces into two separate factors.

Including the unemployment insurance tax rating prohibits the Grant Review Committee from seeing the individual scores because it is protected information. We could ask the employer to provide their UI tax rating directly to us or we could ask the applicant to tell us if they have a positive score.

- There is concern that employers will not know what their UI Tax Rate is.
- We could remove this item from the matrix and then put it as a question on the application. If they do not have a positive UI Tax Rate they would have the opportunity to explain why it is negative. Then the Grant Review Committee could decide if they are comfortable funding their request. The Committee would like to use this option.
- This is an important metric. It goes back to the return on investment. It is not a good thing to invest in a company that has a high turnover rate.

The expanded score/max award amount scale was reviewed. Is the \$250 per employee be worth it to the employer?

- Absolutely yes. Companies could do a lot of training with \$250 per employee. Around 75% of the applications that have come through in the last year are requesting less than what is recommended by the funding model.



## WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

317 West Main Street, Boise, Idaho 83735-0510

The Committee is comfortable with the funding range that was presenting.

The WDC staff will run a few grants through the new model and then present it to the Committee. The Committee can then finalize the Funding Model once there are relevant examples available.

### **Review Safety and "Soft Skill" Training Data**

Ms. Secrist went over a report on how many of the grants funded this year incorporated safety and soft skill training. Please see attached report.

### **January 10 Committee Meeting Planning**

On January 10 the Council decided they wanted to incorporate an in-person committee meeting into the agenda. The plan is to have the Policy Committee and Grant Review Committee have a joint meeting. This will help move along the discussion on the safety and soft skills training. The Grant Review Committee is looking for clarity from the Policy Committee and a joint meeting would be very beneficial. Great discussion could come from this meeting.

It would also be beneficial to review the In-Demand Occupations discussion with the Grant Review Committee. It would help them see what occupations are in high demand. The Grant Review Committee has discussed making the In-Demand Occupations a qualitative piece of the applications.

**Meeting Adjourned**