



**SOUTH FLORIDA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**November 27, 2007  
8:30 A.M**

South Florida Workforce Investment Board Headquarters  
7300 Corporate Center Drive  
5th Floor - Conference Room 3  
Miami, Florida 33126

**AGENDA**

1. Call to Order and Introductions
2. Approval of Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
  - August 31, 2007
3. Service Delivery Discussion
4. Legislative Update
5. Mobile Service Unit Launch Discussion
6. Florida Career and Professional Education Act



2.

*Executive Committee*

*September 25, 2007*

***MINUTES OF SFWIB EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE MEETING AUGUST 31, 2007***

South Florida Workforce Investment Board  
 Executive Committee Meeting  
 August 31, 2007, at 8:30 A.M.  
 South Florida Workforce Investment Board Headquarters  
 7300 Corporate Center Drive, 5th Floor - Conference Room 3

| <b>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS<br/>IN ATTENDANCE</b>  | <b>SFW STAFF</b>   | <b>OTHER ATTENDEES</b>  |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Edward Margolis, Chairman<br>2. Jeff Bridges<br>3. Luis Cerezo<br>4. Daniel Fils-Aime<br>5. Frederick Marinelli<br>6. Andre (Andy) Perez | Beasley, Rick<br>Glancy, Anne<br>Kistner, Ken<br>Pierre, Linda | Llerena, Luis, CBT<br>Ramirez, Maggie, City of Hialeah<br>Rodriguez, Maria, Youth Co-op, Inc. |
| <b>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS<br/>NOT IN ATTENDANCE</b>  |  |   |
| 7. Joe Chi<br>8. Cynthia Gaber<br>9. Regina Giles   |  |   |

Agenda items are displayed in the order they were discussed.

**1. Call to Order and Introductions**

Chairperson Edward Margolis called the meeting to order at 8:43 A.M., welcomed those present, and introductions were made. He added that a quorum was achieved.

**2. Approval of Executive Committee Meeting Minutes of May 2, 2007, May 29, 2007 and July 24, 2007**

Jeff Bridges moved to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2007, May 29, 2007 and July 24, 2007 Executive Committee meetings. The motion was seconded by Fred Marinelli and approved.

**3. Discussion of SFWIB Retreat**

Mr. Margolis stressed the importance of attending the 2007 SFWIB Retreat scheduled to take place September 28 through the 30<sup>th</sup>.

There was much discussion regarding the areas to be covered, and the desired outcomes.

Mr. Margolis noted that this region is not getting the right kind of attention from Tallahassee.

He also noted that a survey taken at meetings of Workforce Florida from August 22<sup>nd</sup> to the 23<sup>rd</sup> in Ft. Lauderdale, showed that the State's greatest asset is international business. He added that international business is not on our Target Occupations List (TOL), this region is not addressing the necessity for this occupation and stressed that the TOL must be looked at in more depth to achieve the required skill level to serve the needs of this sector.

Mr. Marinelli commented that the municipalities had been working with international companies, but found that the necessary skill level is not available here.

Mr. Margolis commented that there needs to be discussion on creating additional internships and that the Economic Development Committee could quantify. Mr. Marinelli noted that Miami-Dade Schools has initiatives involving internships with Spain, Germany, Italy, etc.

Mr. Marinelli commented that 20 years ago the local labor pool had been sufficient, but now they are not skilled enough.

Mr. Perez commented that this board must listen more to business, and less to educators because businesses know what specific requirements they are looking for in an employee.

He also suggested working with more chambers of commerce, and schedule more meetings in both counties with them.

Mr. Perez offered, as Chair of the Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee, to spearhead an initiative to meet with local chambers of commerce in Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties to find out what businesses really need before meeting with legislators in Tallahassee. He added that he would work with staff to produce a survey to collect data for this initiative. Mr. Margolis noted that that could be considered a charge of the Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee.

Mr. Beasley noted that Jackie Harder, President of the Key Largo Chamber, comments continuously that Monroe County needs workers. He added that SFW is a member of some local Chambers; South Dade; Miami-Dade; Greater Miami; and Hialeah, and will join others.

Mr. Bridges noted that there are obstacles working with chambers of commerce, in that you must have a committee, or fit into a committee. He suggested that to be most influential, SFW could work with the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce in September, a slow period for their education committee

Mr. Margolis announced that the Small Business Development Center, funded by the Small Business Administration, approached SFW for ways to work together. The contract is to do similar services throughout the country. The idea is to help develop international business in South Florida, and we have the potential to receive \$400,000 for this project and it may be an opportunity to bring them into our Career Centers to give seminars, such as entrepreneurial skills so that customers might open their own businesses. Some Chambers of Commerce are also involved in this project.

He added that he had contacted the local Small Business Administration and found that they would be glad to provide speakers for seminars at the Career Centers.

Mr. Marinelli noted that chambers of commerce must be given credit when they are involved. He added that working together would prove more productive than if each entity acted on its own.

Mr. Margolis mentioned a comment made by Mr. Fils-Aime earlier, that we must keep a balance of the high, low and medium skill jobs.

Mr. Margolis noted that local community development representatives were invited to the SFWIB retreat.

Mr. Beasley reported that there were confirmations from 19 SFWIB Members thus far, and staff continues to call the Members. In addition, Mr. Beasley reported that only 10 SFWIB Members have completed the online survey in preparation for the retreat.

Mr. Cerezo stated that when the survey is completed by the Member, there is no confirmation that it was completed, and there is no way to copy the survey before sending.

Mr. Cerezo commented that SFW needs to build a sense of commitment with the Members.

Mr. Beasley noted that few Members attend events when invited.

Mr. Perez commented that out of 95 members in his fraternity during college, only 30 attended, and 10 did the work.

He then added that in his opinion, this Executive Committee should be the group to establish the SFWIB Mission Statement. Mr. Beasley agreed there needs to be a commitment of the Members to attend events.

He added that important conversations need to be held in the Executive Committee meetings, and let other work be done by the other committees.

Mr. Margolis requested that staff make it a priority to call those Members who have not yet responded regarding the retreat.

There followed discussion as to whether or not it would be a "Sunshine Law" violation for the Executive Director to call SFWIB Members to let them know there is a meeting and to ask if they will attend. Mr. Margolis summed up concerning strategies to favorably engage the State, and noted that continuing to do the work SFW has set out to do is the best strategy.

#### **4. Discussion of the External Independent Audit Services**

Mr. Margolis noted that in reference to the issue raised concerning Sharpton, Brunson & Company, P.A. on the auditing of WorkforceOne in Broward, was not the responsibility of the auditors, but an internal control issue. SFW must look at its own internal procedures. Mr. Marinelli responded that SFW has had and continues to have controls, and that those controls may now be overly strict as they relate to the service providers.

Mr. Bridges suggested that control procedures be reviewed and changes recommended if and/or needed. He added that no controls are fool-proof.

Discussion followed as to the review performed by the external auditor, and that their job is to ensure that the controls exist, not whether they work. A forensic auditor would be necessary to do more.

Mr. Beasley distributed a memorandum dated August 20, 2007 from Christopher Mazzella, Inspector General for, Miami-Dade County, attached to which was a copy of the August 17, 2007 advisory opinion by the Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics and Public Trust. He added that the Finance Committee recommended Sharpton, Brunson & Company, P.A, the audit firm that performed the audit for WorkforceOne, as a second choice to perform SFW's audit before he was informed.

He went on to add that audit firms are not responsible to find or detect fraud, and the Finance Committee had performed due diligence as required.

Mr. Bridges noted that Sharpton, Brunson & Company, P.A. has a fraud officer on staff who would be involved in the SFW audit, if selected.

Mr. Beasley updated the Members on how the fraud was committed at WorkforceOne.

Mr. Marinelli commented that the Board approved Sharpton, Brunson & Company, P.A. as the second choice, if the first choice fell through.

Mr. Beasley noted that the Finance Committee did their job, and he has had conversations with Jim Doyal at the Agency for Workforce Innovation, who had no problem with the company, adding that that was not in their scope of work.

#### **5. Legislative Update**

There was discussion regarding various pieces of legislation currently being considered and the possible impact on the Region.

Mr. Margolis thanked everyone and the meeting adjourned at 10:10 A.M.



3.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

*November 27, 2007*

**Discussion of Service Delivery**

**Discussion Item**

**BACKGROUND**

The Executive Committee in order to provide guidance to the Workforce Systems Improvement Committee in developing recommendations concerning the Region's Service Delivery may wish to discuss the following:

- Number of Providers that operate Career Centers
- Future locations of the Career Centers
- Access point criteria



4.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

**November 27, 2007**

**Legislative Update – WIA Rescission**

**Discussion Item**

**BACKGROUND**

The U.S. House of Representatives passed Rescission language in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2008 (H.R. 3043), to recapture carryover, remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Labor under the Training and Employment Services (TES) heading for fiscal years 2006 and prior years, which is approximately \$335,000,000 million dollars.

Under WIA, states have up to three program years to spend funds allotted to them through the three state formula grant programs. The proposed rescission would reduce unexpended funds from the three WIA state formula grant programs – Dislocated Worker, Adult, and Youth employment and training activities.

The estimated carryover for the nation is \$1.13 billion dollars. The estimated numbers for Florida is \$62.4 million dollars, which is 5.5% of the total national carryover. The potential impact of the rescission for Florida is \$18.4 million dollars. The potential impact for South Florida Workforce is \$2.7 million dollars. The attached Tables are based on a \$335,000,000 million dollar rescission.

**Table 1** shows the possible distribution of the rescission, using the PY2005 to PY2006 carryover data (as a proxy for the PY2006 to PY2007 carryover). Column 1 shows the amount of carryover available for rescission; column 2, each state’s carryover as a percentage of the total; columns 3 through 5, the amount rescinded for each program, by state; and column 6, the total amount rescinded by state.

**Table 2** shows the possible distribution / impacts of the rescission to the workforce regions of Florida. Column 1 shows the relative share of funding allocation for each workforce region. Column 2 is the possible rescission or impact by program for each region. Column 3 is the total possible rescission.

The final bill approved by the Congress included a rescission of \$245,000,000 million dollars instead of the \$335,000,000 million dollars. The President vetoed Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2008 (H.R.3043),

The Committee may wish to discuss and develop a letter template concerning the WIA rescission which Boards members could sign.

*Attachments*

**Table 1: Estimated Amount by State and Program That Could be Rescinded Based on Each State's Proportion of PY2006 Carryover and a Rescission of \$335 million**

| State                | Total Carryover to PY2006 | Percent of Total Carryover | Amount that Would be Rescinded, By Program |                      |                      |                       |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
|                      |                           |                            | Dislocated Worker                          | Adult                | Youth                | Total                 |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>\$ 1,135,689,017</b>   | <b>100.00%</b>             | <b>\$ 165,682,000</b>                      | <b>\$ 96,590,000</b> | <b>\$ 72,728,000</b> | <b>\$ 335,000,000</b> |
| Alabama              | \$ 16,759,972             | 1.48%                      | \$ 2,424,000                               | \$ 1,254,000         | \$ 1,266,000         | \$ 4,944,000          |
| Alaska               | \$ 1,862,429              | 0.16%                      | \$ 230,000                                 | \$ 117,000           | \$ 202,000           | \$ 549,000            |
| Arizona              | \$ 23,281,779             | 2.05%                      | \$ 2,984,000                               | \$ 2,185,000         | \$ 1,699,000         | \$ 6,868,000          |
| Arkansas             | \$ 12,048,658             | 1.06%                      | \$ 1,630,000                               | \$ 1,071,000         | \$ 854,000           | \$ 3,554,000          |
| California           | \$ 132,539,269            | 11.67%                     | \$ 19,289,000                              | \$ 9,895,000         | \$ 9,912,000         | \$ 39,096,000         |
| Colorado             | \$ 21,838,622             | 1.92%                      | \$ 3,179,000                               | \$ 1,453,000         | \$ 1,810,000         | \$ 6,442,000          |
| Connecticut          | \$ 5,020,617              | 0.44%                      | \$ 694,000                                 | \$ 474,000           | \$ 313,000           | \$ 1,481,000          |
| Delaware             | \$ 1,826,640              | 0.16%                      | \$ 252,000                                 | \$ 238,000           | \$ 49,000            | \$ 539,000            |
| District of Columbia | \$ 3,806,052              | 0.34%                      | \$ 228,000                                 | \$ 439,000           | \$ 456,000           | \$ 1,123,000          |
| <b>Florida</b>       | <b>\$ 62,474,076</b>      | <b>5.50%</b>               | <b>\$ 8,155,000</b>                        | <b>\$ 7,760,000</b>  | <b>\$ 2,513,000</b>  | <b>\$ 18,428,000</b>  |
| Georgia              | \$ 24,354,761             | 2.14%                      | \$ 3,327,000                               | \$ 2,442,000         | \$ 1,416,000         | \$ 7,184,000          |
| Hawaii               | \$ 2,883,398              | 0.25%                      | \$ 286,000                                 | \$ 301,000           | \$ 264,000           | \$ 851,000            |
| Idaho                | \$ 2,107,890              | 0.19%                      | \$ 212,000                                 | \$ 221,000           | \$ 188,000           | \$ 622,000            |
| Illinois             | \$ 56,428,495             | 4.97%                      | \$ 8,825,000                               | \$ 4,512,000         | \$ 3,308,000         | \$ 16,645,000         |
| Indiana              | \$ 28,150,373             | 2.48%                      | \$ 4,053,000                               | \$ 2,324,000         | \$ 1,927,000         | \$ 8,304,000          |
| Iowa                 | \$ 5,791,717              | 0.51%                      | \$ 664,000                                 | \$ 409,000           | \$ 635,000           | \$ 1,708,000          |
| Kansas               | \$ 12,429,000             | 1.09%                      | \$ 2,013,000                               | \$ 927,000           | \$ 726,000           | \$ 3,666,000          |
| Kentucky             | \$ 20,798,878             | 1.83%                      | \$ 2,313,000                               | \$ 1,939,000         | \$ 1,883,000         | \$ 6,135,000          |
| Louisiana            | \$ 23,569,847             | 2.08%                      | \$ 2,668,000                               | \$ 2,347,000         | \$ 1,938,000         | \$ 6,953,000          |
| Maine                | \$ 2,204,576              | 0.19%                      | \$ 258,000                                 | \$ 244,000           | \$ 148,000           | \$ 650,000            |
| Maryland             | \$ 10,570,884             | 0.93%                      | \$ 1,171,000                               | \$ 947,000           | \$ 1,001,000         | \$ 3,118,000          |
| Massachusetts        | \$ 13,632,006             | 1.20%                      | \$ 2,234,000                               | \$ 917,000           | \$ 870,000           | \$ 4,021,000          |
| Michigan             | \$ 37,069,707             | 3.26%                      | \$ 6,490,000                               | \$ 3,178,000         | \$ 1,266,000         | \$ 10,935,000         |
| Minnesota            | \$ 9,355,569              | 0.82%                      | \$ 1,857,000                               | \$ 733,000           | \$ 170,000           | \$ 2,760,000          |
| Mississippi          | \$ 6,986,119              | 0.62%                      | \$ 1,139,000                               | \$ 432,000           | \$ 489,000           | \$ 2,061,000          |
| Missouri             | \$ 10,442,358             | 0.92%                      | \$ 1,491,000                               | \$ 563,000           | \$ 1,026,000         | \$ 3,080,000          |
| Montana              | \$ 1,719,927              | 0.15%                      | \$ 134,000                                 | \$ 197,000           | \$ 176,000           | \$ 507,000            |
| Nebraska             | \$ 6,076,142              | 0.54%                      | \$ 840,000                                 | \$ 459,000           | \$ 493,000           | \$ 1,792,000          |
| Nevada               | \$ 2,438,554              | 0.21%                      | \$ 318,000                                 | \$ 297,000           | \$ 104,000           | \$ 719,000            |
| New Hampshire        | \$ 3,228,483              | 0.28%                      | \$ 371,000                                 | \$ 365,000           | \$ 217,000           | \$ 952,000            |
| New Jersey           | \$ 36,188,592             | 3.19%                      | \$ 5,571,000                               | \$ 3,173,000         | \$ 1,930,000         | \$ 10,675,000         |
| New Mexico           | \$ 10,745,147             | 0.95%                      | \$ 1,776,000                               | \$ 1,086,000         | \$ 307,000           | \$ 3,170,000          |
| New York             | \$ 102,728,216            | 9.05%                      | \$ 19,920,000                              | \$ 6,057,000         | \$ 4,325,000         | \$ 30,302,000         |
| North Carolina       | \$ 32,175,903             | 2.83%                      | \$ 4,605,000                               | \$ 2,774,000         | \$ 2,112,000         | \$ 9,491,000          |
| North Dakota         | \$ 1,711,663              | 0.15%                      | \$ 111,000                                 | \$ 180,000           | \$ 214,000           | \$ 505,000            |
| Ohio                 | \$ 81,509,344             | 7.18%                      | \$ 10,459,000                              | \$ 6,792,000         | \$ 6,792,000         | \$ 24,043,000         |
| Oklahoma             | \$ 16,523,795             | 1.45%                      | \$ 2,171,000                               | \$ 1,297,000         | \$ 1,406,000         | \$ 4,874,000          |
| Oregon               | \$ 18,788,236             | 1.65%                      | \$ 3,416,000                               | \$ 1,053,000         | \$ 1,074,000         | \$ 5,542,000          |
| Pennsylvania         | \$ 37,830,379             | 3.33%                      | \$ 5,556,000                               | \$ 2,962,000         | \$ 2,640,000         | \$ 11,159,000         |
| Puerto Rico          | \$ 36,355,490             | 3.20%                      | \$ 4,855,000                               | \$ 3,347,000         | \$ 2,521,000         | \$ 10,724,000         |
| Rhode Island         | \$ 2,955,930              | 0.26%                      | \$ 444,000                                 | \$ 235,000           | \$ 193,000           | \$ 872,000            |
| South Carolina       | \$ 25,462,510             | 2.24%                      | \$ 3,932,000                               | \$ 2,349,000         | \$ 1,230,000         | \$ 7,511,000          |
| South Dakota         | \$ 2,589,740              | 0.23%                      | \$ 199,000                                 | \$ 288,000           | \$ 277,000           | \$ 764,000            |
| Tennessee            | \$ 23,149,779             | 2.04%                      | \$ 2,916,000                               | \$ 2,334,000         | \$ 1,579,000         | \$ 6,829,000          |
| Texas                | \$ 77,884,947             | 6.86%                      | \$ 10,204,000                              | \$ 7,672,000         | \$ 5,098,000         | \$ 22,974,000         |
| Utah                 | \$ 4,964,493              | 0.44%                      | \$ 469,000                                 | \$ 491,000           | \$ 504,000           | \$ 1,464,000          |
| Vermont              | \$ 677,113                | 0.06%                      | \$ 39,000                                  | \$ 154,000           | \$ 7,000             | \$ 200,000            |
| Virginia             | \$ 19,899,531             | 1.75%                      | \$ 2,905,000                               | \$ 1,728,000         | \$ 1,237,000         | \$ 5,870,000          |
| Washington           | \$ 26,077,264             | 2.30%                      | \$ 4,339,000                               | \$ 2,276,000         | \$ 1,076,000         | \$ 7,692,000          |
| West Virginia        | \$ 4,183,304              | 0.37%                      | \$ 512,000                                 | \$ 453,000           | \$ 269,000           | \$ 1,234,000          |
| Wisconsin            | \$ 10,260,670             | 0.90%                      | \$ 1,502,000                               | \$ 1,017,000         | \$ 508,000           | \$ 3,027,000          |
| Wyoming              | \$ 1,330,173              | 0.12%                      | \$ 53,000                                  | \$ 227,000           | \$ 113,000           | \$ 392,000            |

| State of Florida Workforce Regions                     |  | Relative Share by Program |                |           | Amount that Would be Rescinded, By Program |                     |                   | Total Rescission Reduction |
|--|--|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|--|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
|  |  | WIA Adult                 | WIA Dislocated | WIA Youth | Adult Program                              | Dislocated Program  | Youth Program     |                            |
|  |  |                           |                |           | \$ 7,760,000                               | \$ 8,155,000        | \$ 2,513,000      |                            |
| <b>AWI / WFI - Administration and State Activities</b> |  |                           |                |           | <b>\$ 1,164,000</b>                        | <b>\$ 3,262,000</b> | <b>\$ 376,950</b> | <b>\$ 4,802,950</b>        |
| 1  | Workforce Escarosa, Inc.   | 2.5%                      | 1.8%           | 3.2%      | \$ 165,706                                 | \$ 88,879           | \$ 68,657         | \$ 323,241                 |
| 2  | Workforce Development Board of Okaloosa and Walton Counties        | 0.6%                      | 0.8%           | 0.5%      | \$ 39,142                                  | \$ 39,503           | \$ 10,838         | \$ 89,483                  |
| 3  | Chipola Regional Workforce Planning Board                          | 1.2%                      | 0.6%           | 1.1%      | \$ 76,458                                  | \$ 27,733           | \$ 23,644         | \$ 127,836                 |
| 4  | Gulf Coast Workforce Development Board                             | 1.7%                      | 1.1%           | 1.8%      | \$ 113,750                                 | \$ 53,263           | \$ 38,033         | \$ 205,046                 |
| 5  | Workforce Plus   | 2.2%                      | 1.3%           | 2.7%      | \$ 142,907                                 | \$ 62,964           | \$ 56,852         | \$ 262,723                 |
| 6  | North Florida Workforce Development Board                          | 1.1%                      | 0.6%           | 1.0%      | \$ 72,361                                  | \$ 30,425           | \$ 21,610         | \$ 124,396                 |
| 7  | Florida Crown Workforce Board Inc.                                 | 0.9%                      | 0.4%           | 0.8%      | \$ 57,618                                  | \$ 20,622           | \$ 17,909         | \$ 96,148                  |
| 8  | WorkSource   | 7.0%                      | 8.4%           | 7.1%      | \$ 464,168                                 | \$ 413,226          | \$ 151,316        | \$ 1,028,710               |
| 9  | Alachua/Bradford Regional Workforce Board                          | 1.2%                      | 0.9%           | 1.5%      | \$ 77,471                                  | \$ 42,032           | \$ 32,992         | \$ 152,495                 |
| 10   | Citrus Levy Marion Regional Workforce Development Board            | 1.6%                      | 2.2%           | 1.5%      | \$ 106,980                                 | \$ 108,306          | \$ 32,896         | \$ 248,181                 |
| 11   | Workforce Development Board of Flagler and Volusia Counties, Inc.  | 2.0%                      | 3.1%           | 2.7%      | \$ 133,162                                 | \$ 150,464          | \$ 56,995         | \$ 340,621                 |
| 12   | WORKFORCE CENTRAL FLORIDA  | 7.0%                      | 11.2%          | 7.7%      | \$ 464,471                                 | \$ 546,599          | \$ 164,666        | \$ 1,175,735               |
| 13   | Brevard Workforce Development Board, Inc.                          | 1.6%                      | 2.8%           | 1.6%      | \$ 103,630                                 | \$ 137,633          | \$ 34,898         | \$ 276,161                 |
| 14   | WorkNet Pinellas   | 4.1%                      | 5.1%           | 3.0%      | \$ 273,292                                 | \$ 250,654          | \$ 63,060         | \$ 587,006                 |
| 15   | Tampa Bay WorkForce Alliance, Inc.                                 | 5.9%                      | 6.4%           | 7.2%      | \$ 390,311                                 | \$ 314,720          | \$ 154,064        | \$ 859,094                 |
| 16   | Pasco-Hernando Jobs and Education Partnership Regional Board, Inc. | 1.9%                      | 3.2%           | 1.5%      | \$ 124,595                                 | \$ 156,064          | \$ 32,235         | \$ 312,894                 |
| 17   | Polk County Workforce Development Board, Inc.                      | 3.6%                      | 3.2%           | 3.7%      | \$ 239,309                                 | \$ 156,967          | \$ 78,148         | \$ 474,425                 |
| 18   | Suncoast Workforce Board, Inc.                                     | 1.6%                      | 3.3%           | 1.1%      | \$ 106,013                                 | \$ 162,831          | \$ 24,038         | \$ 292,882                 |
| 19   | Heartland Workforce Investment Board, Inc.                         | 1.3%                      | 0.8%           | 1.5%      | \$ 84,243                                  | \$ 40,711           | \$ 31,056         | \$ 156,010                 |
| 20   | Workforce Development Board of the Treasure Coast                  | 4.1%                      | 4.0%           | 4.3%      | \$ 270,908                                 | \$ 198,088          | \$ 90,908         | \$ 559,904                 |
| 21   | Workforce Alliance, Inc.   | 9.4%                      | 8.3%           | 9.1%      | \$ 622,902                                 | \$ 405,235          | \$ 194,718        | \$ 1,222,855               |
| 22   | Broward Workforce Development Board                                | 9.1%                      | 9.8%           | 7.5%      | \$ 600,303                                 | \$ 478,466          | \$ 160,254        | \$ 1,239,024               |
| 23   | South Florida Workforce Board                                      | 23.5%                     | 15.1%          | 23.5%     | \$ 1,547,378                               | \$ 737,040          | \$ 501,196        | \$ 2,785,614               |
| 24   | Southwest Florida Workforce Development Board                      | 4.8%                      | 5.5%           | 4.5%      | \$ 318,921                                 | \$ 270,576          | \$ 95,067         | \$ 684,565                 |





5.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

*November 27, 2007*

**Mobile Service Unit Launch**

**Discussion**

**BACKGROUND**

The first Mobile Service Unit will be delivered on December 5, 2007, and the second unit will be delivered a few weeks later.

The Committee may wish to discuss the launch of the Mobile Service Units.



6.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

*November 27, 2007*

**Florida Career and Professional Education Act**

## **Discussion**

### **BACKGROUND**

On December 7, 2007, SFW is hosting a meeting at the Robert Morgan Educational Center on the Florida Career and Professional Act.

The Florida Career and Professional Education Act (FCPA), Chapter 2007-216, passed during the 2007 legislative session ensures Career and Technical Education programs are academically rigorous and relevant to the work place, and it provides a statutory bond between Career and Technical Education and the Workforce Development System. The act requires that a strategic 5-year plan be jointly developed between school districts, regional workforce boards and postsecondary institutions. A FCPA Joint Implementation Team is currently developing planning instructions and guidance to assist local areas in developing their 5-year strategic plans.

The Florida Department of Education, Agency for Workforce Innovation and the FCPA Joint Implementation Team are convening regional sessions to provide additional technical assistance to local areas in preparing their 5-year strategic plan. In order for us to achieve the high level of business involvement envisioned by the legislation, it is important that we solicit and obtain the support and input of key partners; school districts, postsecondary institutions and local employers/employer groups.

The meeting discussions are divided into two sessions: a general plenary session (approximately 2 hours) to provide an opportunity for key partners and employers to have a high-level discussion and visioning on the career academy approach and a technical session (approximately 2 hours) to provide an opportunity for local planners and implementers to obtain technical assistance from the state team on preparing the strategic 5-year planning documents.