O. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: LOCAL PLAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SESSIONS

In January-February 2013, the California Workforce Investment Board (State Board), EDD Regional Advisors and the Employment Training Panel (ETP) conducted eight Local Plan technical assistance sessions. All 49 Local Boards were invited to these sessions. The purpose of these sessions was to:

- Provide an overview of the state-level vision, goals and direction outlined in the State Strategic Workforce Development Plan (State Plan);
- Explain how the Local Plans are to be consistent with the State Plan;
- Review in detail the Interim Local Planning Guidance and Interim High-Performance Local Board Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Local Plans and Local Board Certification (State Plan Appendices H and I);
- Promote ETP services as a vehicle to help achieve the SB 734 training expenditure requirement; and
- Address questions from Local Boards regarding the State Plan and content of the Local Plans.

All eight sessions were recorded, and this document represents an edited compilation of questions asked and the State Board’s responses. The questions and answers are arranged to be consistent with the pertinent Chapter/Appendix of the State Plan.

STATE PLAN CHAPTERS I, III and IV

Q: In regards to the State Working Group of state agencies, has the State Board thought about including Caltrans given their many construction projects and workforce needs?

A: Yes. Caltrans is not yet a member of the State Working Group, but the State Board intends to bring them to the table. Caltrans does invest in ensuring access to its infrastructure jobs for low-income and disadvantaged populations and communities. Some Local Boards are working with Caltrans with varying levels of success. Better alignment with Caltrans presents important coordination opportunities for Local Boards and joint labor-management apprenticeship programs.
Q: Is the State Working Group a separate committee or is it part of another committee?

A: The State Working Group is an informal advisory or focus group comprised of the directors of state departments that administer workforce, employment, career education, and/or workforce training programs. It not a formal committee of the State Board nor is it part of another committee. The purpose is to brainstorm and advise each agency and department on the effective coordination and alignment of broader workforce system programs, services, and system outcomes.

Q: Regarding the emphasis throughout the State Plan on “earn and learn” training models, the State Board is doing a lot of work emphasizing apprenticeship. How does the apprenticeship model fit into the role of the State Working Group?

A: The apprenticeship model, particularly earn and learn, is effective in engaging employers in a sector in a meaningful way and bridging employment interventions with direct pathways to good jobs. The Governor is very interested in expanding this model.

Quality paid internships and paid work experience that connect to pathways to good jobs are also of keen interest. For this purpose, State Working Group will continue to push for alignment of WIA OJT and customized training, youth programs, CalWORKs, career technical education investments, ETP, and approved apprenticeship.

The State Working Group and the State Board Executive Committee are committed to aligning resources and removing policy barriers to strengthening approved apprenticeship programs and expanding the use of earn and learn. The State Board intends to develop guidance soon on creating and implementing earn and learn strategies.

Q: Will new customized training providers and pre-apprenticeship training programs in apprenticeable occupations have to be on the ETPL?

A: No. Customized training does not have to be provided through ITAs. Although pre-apprenticeship and approved apprenticeship programs could be approved for ETPL and this may be an excellent sustainable practice.

For pre-apprenticeship, Local Boards are encouraged to reach out to Local Building Trades Councils about adopting a nationally recognized and DOL-approved pre-apprenticeship curriculum: “Multi-Craft Core Curriculum” (MC3). Utilization of MC3
must be approved through a Local Building Trades Council (a list of BTCs can be found at http://sbctc.org/doc.asp?id=214&parentid=58).

**Q:** In regards to the Adults Goal in Chapter IV of the State Plan, is it the intent that participants receive just one (1) year of post-secondary education?

**A:** No. The Adults Goal has been revised from “one year of postsecondary education” to a focus on “obtaining a marketable and industry recognized credential or degree.”

**Q:** In regards to the State Plan’s overall emphasis on employer/demand-driven training, the State Board and Local Boards are tasked with doing all of the convening of stakeholders, leveraging of resources, etc., but there appear to be no accountability factors. Has DOLETA given the State Board any guidance on performance metrics?

**A:** Yes. In the DOLETA’s state planning guidance and in statements made by Secretary Hilda Solis, DOLETA clearly expects additional performance metrics. The State Board has prioritized the development of additional performance outcomes and is embarking on a transparent stakeholder process to develop measures that best reflect the good work of Local Boards and the vision of the Governor’s Strategic Workforce Development Plan. See Chapter VI of the State Plan.

**Interim Local Planning Guidance – Appendix H**

**PROPOSED TIMELINE**

**Q:** In regards to the July 1, 2013 Local Plan submission deadline, can a Local Board submit an unsigned plan to the State Board on July 1, 2013 if the Local Plan is going for final approval to the Board of Supervisors or CLEO on a future agenda? This has been allowed in the past.

**A:** Yes. The State Board can work with a Local Board on this, though the official-signed plan must be submitted as soon as possible. If the Board of Supervisors or CLEO makes major changes to the Local Plan in the interim, the Local Board can incorporate those changes through a Local Plan modification.
Q: Do you know when the State Board anticipates having the "response" format and page limitations for the Local Plans in place?

A: The State Board is working with EDD to issue a policy directive as soon as possible providing all aspects of the Local Plan, Local Board recertification, and high-performance Local Board processes. The directive will include an 80-page limit for the body of Local Plan excluding attachments.

Q: Are the PowerPoint slides from the sessions available to Local Boards?

A: Yes, they are on the State Board website, State Plan 2013 tab.

SECTION 1  VISION

Q: The State Plan uses the term “CLEO/Local Board” many times. Does this mean the CLEO and the Local Board or the CLEO or Local Board?

A: CLEO or Local Board.

Q: Can a Local Board act as a “regional workforce and economic development network?”

A: No. However a Local Board can take the lead, or be the “backbone” organization, for a regional network.

Q: What constitutes a regional workforce and economic development network and differentiates it from the One-Stop system or One-Stop network? Will there be a more uniform definition, or will the Local Boards define these terms for themselves through their Local Plans?

A: In general, a “regional workforce and economic development network” is a broad regional coalition of multiple organizations for the purpose of coordination to identify regional needs, priority sectors, and to align resources. Networks may include one or more Local Boards, civic and political leaders, community groups, business leaders, labor leaders, education leaders, industry associations, economic development, philanthropic organizations, etc. Key roles include: identifying regional challenges; agreeing to priority industry sectors; supporting industry sector partnerships and career pathways; aligning resources; removing policy and administrative barriers to that alignment; and accessing federal, state, private and philanthropic resources to sustain the network, invest in specific strategies, and to seed sector partnerships.
The State Plan uses a generic term of “regional workforce and economic development network” to describe, in general terms, a valuable and organic phenomenon occurring around California and in other states. It can take many forms depending on regional circumstances. Local Board directors may recognize these partnerships in their regions under a variety of names and forms, and led by various institutions and formal or informal groups.

This is certainly distinct from One-Stop which is a mechanism for service delivery or for coordinating access to programs and services.

**Q: Do the regional workforce and economic development networks have names?**

**A: Some exist informally and may not have official names.**

There are many that do have names, including Valley Vision in the North Sacramento Valley region, the Los Angeles Workforce Systems Collaborative (LAWSC), California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley, etc.

An example is the work of the Coachella Valley Economic Partnership. It launched *The Career Pathways Initiative* in 2005 in partnership with the James Irvine Foundation and the Riverside County Economic Development Agency and Workforce Investment Board. The Initiative partners with more than 250 industry, economic development and education professionals along with students across nine cities in the Coachella Valley of eastern Riverside County. The Initiative has three industry councils: Healthcare, Advanced Technology, and Arts Media & Entertainment.

An interesting out-of-state example is the Greater Cincinnati Workforce Network (GCWN). With the United Way of Greater Cincinnati as the “backbone,” the coalition includes roughly 150 workforce development stakeholders in a three-state region that encompasses Southwest Ohio, Northern Kentucky, and Southeast Indiana. GCWN is led by a smaller Leadership Council of 15-20 organizations that makes all major decisions and advises a funders collaborative.
Q: What is the importance of an industry sector partnership?

A: This is where the rubber hits the road. For employment and training services to work, they must connect participants to actual jobs and career pathways in target sectors with the best long- and short-term potential for good jobs.

An industry sector partnership is not authentic without the deep engagement of employers in the target sector. Workforce practitioners customize programs and curriculum to address employers’ pipeline needs and build robust career pathways for priority occupations. Employers invest in many ways, including cash and in-kind support or through on-the-job training, paid internships or work experience, or other earn-and-learn arrangements (including formal apprenticeship), hiring agreements, etc. Lead (or “backbone”) organizations may be Local Boards, industry associations, labor-management partnerships, community organizations, economic development agencies, community colleges, etc.

There are many great examples of sector partnerships in CA. Below are just a few:

- In the Sacramento Valley, Valley Vision leads the Green Capital Alliance (GCA). GCA is a broad sector partnership of business, academic, workforce, economic development, sustainability, and clean-tech organizations working to support the region’s clean-tech economy.

- The Bay Area Manufacturing Renaissance Council (BAMRC) is a coalition of Local Boards, manufacturing employers and labor, high schools and community colleges (principally Laney College) establishing manufacturing career pathways in the East Bay. This East Bay partnership is leveraging state CTE funds, TAA and other federal dollars, and local resources.

- In Los Angeles, the Hospitality Training Academy grew out of a labor-management partnership of UNITE-HERE Local 11 and several hotel properties. The initiative began with an L.A. City WIA grant which led to substantial and sustained industry investment. The Academy is now the flagship hospitality sector project for L.A. City and the Los Angeles Community College District.
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Q: Do regional workforce and economic development networks and industry sector partnerships support the State Plan objective to prepare and place individuals into jobs with career pathways?

A: Yes...Absolutely. This is the central framework or “architecture” of identifying target sectors, aligning multiple programs and funding streams, providing relevant services to employers and securing their co-investment, and connecting workers and students to good jobs. If we can effectively and collectively address, at the regional level, the workforce needs of those sectors with the best potential for good jobs now and in the future, we achieve a win-win – driving regional economic strength AND a shared prosperity.

Q: With 49 Local Boards each identifying their industry sectors of focus, how will similar sector initiatives be connected around the state so that collective learning can take place?

A: The State Board has requested that State Board and EDD staff compile a statewide list of all the industry sectors of focus and overlay this information with the Community Colleges priority industry sectors. This comprehensive analysis will be shared with the Local Boards and will help foster collaboration among Local boards and community colleges.

SECTION 2  ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE INFORMATION ANALYSIS

Q: How comprehensive does the Local Plan economic and workforce analysis have to be?

A: The economic and workforce analysis is a critical component of the Local Plan. It should be comprehensive enough to provide the context and justification for the Local Plan vision, strategies, investment priorities, and especially the target industry sectors. The effectiveness of local WIA investments going forward will depend on data-driven decision making reflected in the Local Plan and the careful selection of target sectors. Additionally, a quality economic and workforce analysis may improve prospects for high-performance Local Board status in future years as the State Board moves from largely qualitative standards (this year) to quantitative measures of high-performance (2015 and beyond).
As with the rest of the Local Plan, the State Board expects this section to be succinct and part of the 80 page limit for the body of Local Plan. Chapter II of the State Plan contains the State Board’s economic and workforce analysis. Local Boards can use Chapter II as a guide for framing their analysis.

Given resource constraints, the State Board encourages Local Boards to utilize existing data and analysis. Local Boards can also share economic and workforce analysis with neighboring jurisdictions within the same region and common labor-market.

Q. Does all the data have to be less than 12 months old?

A: The State Board does expect that Local Boards will work into the analysis recent data -- less than a year old. However, not all the data must be less than a year old. For more real-time data, Local Boards can tap local employers in target sectors through sector committees or other related regional bodies or organizations.

Q: The State Plan emphasizes regionalism, and the Local Planning Guidance is recommending that Local Boards combine their resources to prepare regional economic and workforce analysis. Is the State Board trying to reduce the number of Local Areas?

A: No. Secretary Morgenstern stated very clearly at the February 2013 State Board meeting that the State has no intention of unilaterally reducing the number of Local Areas.

Realizing resource constraints and the potential high cost of developing a new workforce and economic analysis, the State Board is encouraging coordination and resource sharing within regions. It makes little sense for 2 or more neighboring jurisdictions in the same economic region, with the same labor markets, to prepare completely separate economic analyses.

Q: Will the emphasis on local economic and workforce information put the EDD Labor Market Information Division (LMID) out of business?

A: No. Consistent with DOL guidance to states, Local Boards are not restricted to LMID. The State Board is encouraging Local Boards to use a variety of sources in developing the workforce and economic analysis. However, the intent is to enrich the LMID source
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data and analysis, not to replace it. LMID is critical to providing a foundation for the Local Board’s analysis.

Q: What should a Local Board do if it has what it considers a strong workforce and economic analysis from a reputable outside source that contradicts LMID’s workforce and economic analysis?

A: If a Local Board has strong analysis, it is encouraged to use it and cite the source(s). Regardless of the source, the Local Board must be prepared to stand behind its workforce and economic analysis and the sources used.

Q: Does the State Board agree that holding Local Boards accountable for their economic and workforce analysis for 5 years does not allow for changes in the workforce and economy to be reflected?

A: Yes. Local Plans are living documents, and the economic and workforce analysis can be revised and updated as needed.

Q: Does the State Board agree that Local Boards should not place all of their training dollars into sectors of economic importance because that would take away from the filling of replacement jobs being vacated by the retirement of the Baby Boomers?

A: Yes. Targeting specific sectors that have the best potential for lots of good jobs now and in the future (due to growth AND replacements) optimizes investments, improves placements, and improves participant outcomes. However, Local Boards will have circumstances where they must respond to businesses that are outside of the target sectors; this is expected.

It is important to emphasize that selection criteria for identifying target sectors must include projected replacement numbers due to retirements.

Q: How do Local Boards develop a sector strategy that goes beyond their local jurisdiction?

A: Industry sectors don’t normally conform to political boundaries. The Local Plan should describe how Local Board participation in regional networks and sector partnerships allows for addressing target sectors that cross multiple jurisdictions.
SECTION 4  ADULT STRATEGIES

Q: Regarding a strategic layoff aversion strategy – Because there is so little incumbent worker training funds available, this is going to be a tough area for Local Boards to pay much service to.

A: Incumbent worker training is just one component of a layoff aversion strategy (see next question).

Also, incumbent worker training has other virtues; it can be very attractive to employers and is a great way to bring them to the table for new hire opportunities and for broader sector work. Local Boards are encouraged to plan for investing local WIA in incumbent worker training in target industry sectors and, where possible, leveraging Employment Training Panel funds.

Q: Lack of skills is not always the cause for layoffs, in which case incumbent worker training will not help. For layoff aversion, is the State Board ok with Local Boards referring to economic development office?

A: Incumbent worker training is just one tool in the layoff aversion toolkit. Others include work sharing (http://www.edd.ca.gov/unemployment/work_sharing_claims.htm), early warning systems, pre-feasibility studies, local and state incentives and tax credits, etc. These efforts require partnering with other organizations and agencies, including economic development.

The State Board is looking for discussion and concrete activities in the Local Plan that demonstrate the Local Board’s proactive engagement in layoff aversion. Specifically -- how is the Local Board deploying rapid response proactively, particularly in the context of target sectors (not just acting as a reactive response to WARNs and 121s)?

Q: It appears that the State Board wants to increase the number of adults in career pathway pipelines while at the same time the WIA system is facing sequestration cuts. Is the State Board looking at this?

A: We are aware of the uncertainty at the federal level regarding funding. This makes it all the more urgent for Local Boards, as regional and local conveners, to continue partnering, leveraging, and finding efficiencies where possible.

Q: Regarding Adult job readiness training – how does the State Board see Local Boards being able to apply that to the 25% training expenditure requirement?
A: This question is addressed in the SB 734 directive. See Definition of Terms. Also see the link to Summary of Comments http://www.edd.ca.gov/Jobs_and_Training/pubs/wsd11-9.pdf.

SECTION 5 YOUTH STRATEGIES

Q: Does the youth goal focus on high school mean that Local Boards must focus more on in-school youth?

A: No. There is no intent to affect a Local Board’s decision about whether to focus more on in-school vs. more on out-of-school youth (however there is a minimum expenditure requirement for out-of-school youth).

Q: In regards to the State Plan wanting the Local Boards to align programs and funding systems, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office issued RFPs for sector navigators without involving Local Boards at the front-end of development of the RFP.

A: It is a priority of the State Board, on which the Chancellor serves, to continue to ensure greater coordination with the Chancellor’s Office and with the community college system.

Q: Regarding the inclusion of Job Corps -- Job Corps has recently enacted a national enrollment freeze. In addition, Job Corps’ 7 sites do not cover every region of the State.

A: DOLETA and the regional office in particular, is expecting integration with Job Corps. It is our intent to work with DOLETA to help develop connections among Local Boards and Job Corps where possible.
Q: What are expectations regarding county probation departments and Local Boards in addressing realignment and employment services for ex-offenders?

A: The State Plan does not specifically respond to serving the ex-offender population in the context of realignment in the corrections system. However Local Boards are encouraged to discuss in their Local Plans anticipated efforts to work with county probation departments, sheriffs, and other relevant county departments and elected officials, well as community organizations, to ensure that workforce development is a key part of local realignment.

SECTION 6 ADMINISTRATION

Q: What is the intent of the first bullet: “Describe how the Local Board is a community leader on workforce issues COMPARED WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS?”

A: (Note: The words in caps above are removed from the final planning guidance.)

The intent here is the same as it is in WIA – the Local Board is a policy body of the important local and regional players necessary for building an effective workforce investment system. This is not to say that the Local Board will always be the lead organization in every regional network or industry sector partnership. However the Local Plan should describe the Local Board’s roles in supporting such efforts.

As described in the State Plan, Local Boards, through diverse membership and regional leadership, can affect coordinated workforce education and training systems and integrate multiple funding streams and programs. Using current labor market and economic data, Local Boards can target resources to strengthen critical regional industries and employers and create clear pathways to good, family-supporting jobs and careers. Consistent with the State Plan, Local Boards are encouraged to:

- Take on strategic community leadership & engage diverse partners;
- Adopt and use sector partnerships as a key to service delivery;
- Prioritize and invest in worker training; and
- Continuously improve service delivery.
Q: In regards to the Local Board’s engagement of key stakeholders in developing the Local Plan, what type of documentation is required in order to show that key stakeholders were actively engaged?

A: Please include relevant meeting records, i.e. meeting notices, sign-in sheets, etc.

Q: In regards to the Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) efforts, does the State Board expect that all Local Boards implement ISD?

A: No. The ISD question is asking Local Boards to describe what their plans are, if any, in terms of formal or informal ISD implementation. The State Board is not mandating that Local Boards implement ISD.

Q: In regards to service integration, has the State Board done any work to require statewide service integration in the One- Stops?

A: The State Board has created a “Future of the One-Stop” workgroup to study and make recommendations on how to sustain One-Stop in California. The State Board is very interested in ensuring that universal core services are delivered efficiently and effectively and that required partners make appropriate co-investments.

SECTION 8 LOCAL WIA COMMON MEASURE PERFORMANCE GOALS

Q: Did DOLETA require the State Board to increase performance measures for PY 2012/2013? Are the PY 2012/2013 state performance goals listed in the State Plan a starting point for Local Board PY 2013/2014 goals?

A: Yes. DOLETA’s regional office assured us that given our current numbers, halfway into the PY, CA was on track to exceed the increased measures. Before the end of this PY, the State Board will reassess the measures with DOLETA and make any necessary adjustments. The final numbers are expected to be the baseline for PY 2013/2014. The State Board, however, will be advocating for and developing (through a stakeholder process) performance measures that best reflect the Governor’s vision and strategic direction for California’s workforce investment system.
Q: Are there any regression models that Local Boards can have access to?

A: Reportedly, there are regression models. The State Board will work with DOLETA to make those available to Local Boards as soon as possible. Use of regression modeling is not required in Local Plans.

Q: While we currently have the Common Measures, is the State Board planning on adding additional state measures, and are they going to be developed as a requirement in the first year of the plan.

A: The State Board has prioritized the development of additional performance measures, and through a stakeholder process will identify desired system outcomes and effective methodology for benchmarking and measuring progress toward those outcomes. The State Board intends to use these performance measures for developing future High-Performance Local Board Standards. Use of additional performance measures will not be required in the first year of the plan.

Q: The Local Board Youth common measures have historically been set statewide by EDD. Will this again be the case?

A: The State Board will work with EDD on this.

Interim High-Performance Local Board Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Local Plans and Local Board Certification – Appendix I

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Q: With no financial incentive, why should a Local Board request high-performance certification?

A: If WIA discretionary funds are restored to the Governor or if other sources of funding are made available for WIA-related statewide activities, Local Boards that are not High-Performance certified may deny themselves access to additional resources. Additionally, the State Board will publicize which Local Boards achieved the High-Performance certification. Elected officials, Local Board chairs, and other board
members will expect that their Local Boards make a concerted effort to achieve High-Performance certification.

**Q:** Once all the Local Plans are submitted, how long will it take the State Board/review team to review them all and provide feedback?

**A:** The State Board has yet to establish the process or methodology for reading the 49 Local Plans. This process will be made public as soon as possible, so that the rules are very clear. We do know that the reading group will include diverse stakeholders (beyond State Board and EDD staff), that the process will be transparent, and that all recommendations will be made to the Governor by October 1, 2013.

**Q:** Will there be time for pre-evaluation and feedback from the state to the Local Areas prior to October 1, 2013?

**A:** No. However, the State Board anticipates a process that includes the opportunity for Local Boards to address any deficiencies either through the corrective action process or in addition to it. The challenge is limited time and resources. Our goal is that all 49 plans receive at least the minimum score for approval, and we are committed to providing the necessary assistance to achieve that goal.

**Q:** How will the reading and scoring process go? Will there be discussion with Local Boards on items that need clarification? Will readers understand the terminology being used?

**A:** The readers will not be just EDD and State Board staff, so some of the readers will not be well versed in WIA terminology. The Local Plan should be written with your Local Board in mind as the audience. In other words, it should be accessible to a lay audience not versed in WIA-speak.

Additionally, there was some discussion about making it easy for the reader to identify where the High-Performance standards and criteria are addressed in the narrative. However, “easy” is the operative term; a plan narrative should not be so replete with crosswalks that it is difficult for the reader to follow.

The State Board staff will contact Local Boards for clarification if needed on parts of the Local Plan before scoring.
Q: Would it be correct to say that for this first round of high-performance Local Board certification, there will be a lot of Local Plans that will be aspirational as opposed to stating that they have implemented all of the high-performance requirements?

A: Yes. The intent is not that the Local Plan is a report about what has been done. It is not a look back; it is a look forward.

We understand that this is new territory for many Local Boards, and it’s not expected that all Local Boards have already done much of the work described in the State Plan and the High-Performance Local Board Standard. Each Local Board is expected to lay out its established goals and objectives (preferably with benchmarks, timelines, expected outcomes, projected investments, and other evidence) and specific concrete steps, actions, and/or plans to achieve the goals and objectives. Each Local Plan, regardless of the past, will be evaluated on its demonstrated commitment to achieving the standards and criteria in the High-Performance Local Board Standard.

Certainly some Local Boards have deep experience in developing regional and sector partnerships, creating career pathways to target occupations, aligning WIA with strategic priorities, leveraged multiple funding sources, etc. Their Local Plans should be less about what they have done, and more about how they will move their work to the next level.

**STANDARD 1 VISION, ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE ANALYSIS, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Q: In regards to Criterion #1, does “measurable” necessarily mean numerical data?

A: It can include numerical data. (In fact the next iteration of the High-Performance Standard will be largely numerically based). However, the Local Plan could also identify specific action steps the Local Board will take to achieve identified goals and objectives; “measurable” in this context can mean that the Local Board can later provide evidence that specific actions or steps were taken that demonstrate progress toward particular goals or objectives, or that specified goals or objectives were accomplished.
STANDARD 2 BUSINESS SERVICE PLAN, PARTNERSHIPS AND SECTOR STRATEGIES

Q: What are the State Board’s expectations in rough form regarding the aspirational content of the Local Plans?

A: See the previous answers. It is fair to say that we will not know until we start reading the plans. The State Board will not score any plans until all plans have been read.

STANDARD 3 ADULT INVESTMENTS IN TRAINING, SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PATHWAYS

Q: In regards to Criterion #1, how does a Local Board ensure that it complies with AB 554? How can WIA dollars be invested in approved apprenticeship?

A: The State Board has partnered on 2 regional AB 554 implementation events (LA and the Greater Bay Area) and hopes to do at least 2 more. The discussions, which will be reported out soon, have revealed that Local Boards and community colleges are working in a variety of ways to coordinate with approved apprenticeship -- through pre-apprenticeship programs; boot camps to recruit new apprenticeship candidates; journey-level upgrade training for green certifications or for unemployed workers; MOUs among multiple Local Boards, apprenticeship programs, and colleges (North Sacramento Valley). For this criterion, a Local Board must describe clear and concrete steps to coordinating with state-approved apprenticeship.

Local Boards are strongly encouraged to make contact with state-approved apprenticeship programs that operate in their jurisdictions (programs can be found at http://www.dir.ca.gov/das/das.html). Local Boards are also encouraged to reach out to Local Building Trades Councils about adopting a nationally recognized and DOLETA-approved pre-apprenticeship curriculum: “Multi-Craft Core Curriculum” (MC3). Utilization of MC3 must be approved through a Local Building Trades Council (a list of BTCs can be found at http://sbctc.org/doc.asp?id=214&parentid=58).

Q: In regards to Criterion #4, can the resource sharing agreements required in Section 7 of the Interim Local Planning Guidance (Appendix H) be used as evidence to earn 2 points?

A: Only if the resource sharing agreements contain the elements of a Written Revenue Plan.
Q: Also in regards to Criterion #4, what are the requirements for the Written Revenue Plan? What should this plan include?

A: “Revenue Plan” is a generic label for describing how the Local Board and its partners will blend existing multiple funding streams or the strategies for raising and leveraging additional public, private, or philanthropic dollars. This can include an estimate of non-WIA funds that are used to deliver activities at a One-Stop or through a local or regional initiative. A Written Revenue Plan may refer to resource sharing agreements, MOUs, or other forms of arrangements among various partners that project common fundraising and leveraging goals. This is an opportunity for Local Boards to plan for achieving SB 734 leveraging.

STANDARD 5  ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOCAL BOARD

Q: Regarding criterion 1, can you clarify what is needed to comply with labor composition requirements in State law?


Subsequent legislation (SB 302, Statutes of 2008) defined “Local labor federation” to mean “…a central labor council that is an organization of local unions affiliated with the California Labor Federation or a local building and construction trades council affiliated with the State Building and Construction Trades Council.”

Q: Regarding criterion 2, second bullet, how do Local Boards that operate their One-Stops respond?

A: This bullet states: “Through a public procurement process or other means, the Local Board has established at least one comprehensive One-Stop in their LWIA.”

The emphasis here is on the clear separation of the policy and oversight role of the Local Board and the provision of services and One-Stop operations. This is a critical aspect of WIA. As one Local Board director put it, “you can’t have the test taker also be the proctor.” (Technically a Local Board that wishes to operate a One-Stop must get agreement from the CLEO and the Governor). For criterion 2, a Local Board must describe the procurement process related to the designation or certification of One-
Stop operators and describe the separation that exists between policy and oversight of the Local Board and One-Stop operations.