

**BRAD LITTLE**  
GOVERNOR

**Wendi Secrist**  
Executive Director



**Trent Clark**  
Chair

**B. J. Swanson**  
Vice Chair

## **WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL**

317 W Main Street, Boise, Idaho 83735-0510

### **WIOA Advisory Group Meeting Minutes August 21, 2020**

**Attendees:** Vicki Isakson, Teresa Pitt, Matt Markve, Kristyn Carr, Admir Selimovic, Rico Barrera, Laurel McMahan, Molly Valceschini, Mike Walsh, Cindy Lehmann

**Staff:** Wendi Secrist, Matthew Thomsen, Paige Nielebeck, Caty Solace

#### **Welcome**

#### **One-Stop Operator Update**

It does not make sense to have the One-Stop Operator chair this group as it becomes more data centered. The One-Stop program manager will still participate in the meetings.

We have talked both in one-stop and WIOA advisory about requesting TA from USDOL, the last one-stop discussion on it, the committee decided to request TA on both design and develop value statements and report on customer experience for each program. We are waiting to hear back on their decision. We are not sure if we will get it or not.

#### **Individual Agency Evaluations & Opportunity to Participate in Peer-Learning Cohort**

#### **WDC**

We don't have an evaluation under WIOA. We do an evaluation of the WDTF every two years. We look into the investments we are making and see how they are impacting Idaho's workforce (higher wages, job retention, etc.). Our goal is to retain workers in Idaho. We have been struggling looking at what additional factors we can evaluate. The last evaluation that was done, showed the wage increase for people who received training under the WDTF was over 25% compared to the general public was 6%.

#### **IDOL**

They are going to pivot and the evaluation cohort is going to help them. Even though it is labeled WIOA evaluation it also incorporates part of WIA. They were surprised looking at the results because they were very positive. The analysis showed that the SDA's were implementing different approaches to serving dislocated workers. You could see changes in the success rates

of the different approaches. Multiple services tend to generate better results than singular services. One service alone is not going to make a big change in someone's life. Eventually they would like to end up with an overall comprehensive evaluation. The goal would be to have all one-stop partners participate in the evaluation as well. Since it was the first WIOA evaluation, it provided really great baseline data since it looked at all participants. Now that they have the baseline evaluation, going forward and measuring more specific things will be easier.

## **VR**

They have been doing things within their program for decades. They are evaluating their quality and compliance in case documentation. RSA youth monitor all VR programs once every 5 years. They want to see all of their policies, procedures, guidance, etc. It was a big process and review. They have not in Idaho had a review in 12 years by RSA. They also have fiscal audits. They are trying to strengthen the use of their own data. Because they have had such a huge shift in data reporting requirements, they are focusing on ensuring the data is accurate. They have been doing a lot of internal data validation checks. They negotiated new standards with RSA. In the last 2 years, they have been talking more about their internal control framework, writing them down, and having procedures. They feel they are weak at looking at their data and figure out how they can improve. They have a vision of evaluating their participants and finding out the specific services they delivered that led to the successful outcome. They are wanting to evaluate their rural service delivery. The CSNA they are required to do once every 3 years, the data helps inform them on areas that they can improve on. They use that information and combine it with their strategic plan to then create their state plan. It is not just relationships with customers, it is their workforce partners, vendors, staff, etc.

## **ICBVI**

Because ICBVI is mandated the same laws of VR their evaluations are similar. They are doing the same thing as VR. They do internal audits based on case file reviews to ensure they are in compliance with federal, state, and agency policies. The CSNA helps us look at our past goals and priorities and inform us going forward of goals and priorities to work on. With our state plan, we might have had goals to improve outreach to rural communities. In the past, it has always been a soft qualitative narrative response, but this year's state plan was quite different. The next 3-years they are going to be looking for the quantitative data. Those are some of the challenges that we are going to face with the state plan.

## **Title II**

They have not done in-person site visits in 10 years. They do quarterly data desk audits and evaluate the grantees data. There is a lot more they could be doing to evaluate their programs.

## **SCEP**

A lot of the stuff they do is similar to VR. They do annual monitoring site visits with their subrecipients and going out to their sites to meet with participants. They do program compliance and program monitoring and do fiscal monitoring. They are lacking looking at their reporting and things they need to be accomplishing. Making sure those with barriers are getting employment after completing the program. They need to work on gathering the quantitative

data. Overall, their evaluation is looking at program compliance and monitoring. Easter-Seals has the perspective of a national level.

## **NIC**

They have their annual monitoring that is done by their grants managers for the WIOA Adult Program. They are doing the best job they can to track the information when they do have a WDTF grant. They do more self-monitoring. The overall institution does not evaluate their progress, it is an internal process.

## **Peer Learning Cohort**

Ms. Carr reviewed the Peer Learning Cohort Fact sheet. Please see attached document.

The application is due on Monday. This is a big opportunity for us. By the next meeting we should know if Idaho was selected or not.

## **Co-enrollment Data**

Ms. Secrist reviewed the co-enrollment data that Ms. Richardson provided. Please see attached document.

How do we use this across programs to better serve Idahoans?

- ICBVI has around 350 clients across the state, they have one adult co-enrolled with IDOL and one youth co-enrolled with IDOL. This is a little bit of a red flag. We should find out why only one is co-enrolled. Maybe there are barriers that need to be addressed.
  - Between now and the next meeting Ms. Secrist would like Mr. Walsh to gather input from the regions.
- It would be helpful for the CTE programs to be able to break down the data by region. Ms. Secrist will find out if that is possible.
- There are a number of other individuals that are in the other programs that use adult education services. We want to know how they are getting them if they are not being co-enrolled or being referred by the institutions.
- The Title II participants should be co-enrolled with IDOL because their ultimate goal after the program is to be employed.
- Ms. Valceschini will reach out to the centers and find out what their level of knowledge or interaction with co-enrollments. When she did site visits this spring, it seemed like it varied by center.
- There are a lot of opportunities to do more co-enrollments.
- These numbers seem low but are baseline. We can do nothing but get better from here. Funds are tight, having a team approach and collaborating with partners only strengthens our network around the individual to help them be successful.
- This helps inform us as we updated and revise MOU's between agencies.
- There is a gap with Health and Welfare and SCSEP. The more data the better decision making.

**Adjourned at 10:31 a.m.**

DRAFT