



SOUTH FLORIDA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRY SECTOR (EDIS) COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, April 14, 2010

3:00 PM

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 EDIS Committee Meeting Minutes
 - A. December 16, 2010
 - B. February 17, 2010
3. Information – Training Providers Performance Reporting Requirements
4. Information – Employed Worker Training Program Update
5. Recommendation as to Approval of Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, Inc. using Previously Awarded Funds to Consult with Healthy Communities Institute Corporation and The Health Council of South Florida, Inc.'s Miami Matters web tool for an Education Study

South Florida Workforce Investment Board is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities.



2.A

SFWIB - Economic Development & Industry Sector (EDIS) Committee

April 14, 2010

Minutes of SFWIB Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee Meeting December 16, 2009

South Florida Workforce Investment Board
 Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee and Workforce Committee
 December 16, 2009, 3:00 P.M.
 South Florida Workforce Headquarters
 7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
 Miami, FL 33126

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE	OTHER BOARD MEMBERS	OTHER ATTENDEES
1. Andre “Andy” Perez - <i>Chair</i> 2. Harder, Jackie, <i>Vice Chair</i> 3. Ludwig, Phillip 4. Roth, Thomas 5. Russo, Monica	Jennings, Donna Manrique, Carlos	Dalrymple, Nadine – <i>Per Scholas, Inc.</i>
COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE	SFW STAFF	Flores, Oscar – <i>AATI</i>
6. Brecheisen, Bruce 7. Diggs, Bill 8. Regueiro, Maria Cristina 9. Wiedman, Holly	Beasley, Rick Kavehersi, Cheri Edwards, Phillip Glancy, Anne Gomez, Maria Hernandez, Juan Kistner, Ken	Mitchell, Carlana – <i>Miami-Dade County Public Schools</i> Morrow, Nayibe – <i>AATI</i>

Agenda items are displayed in the order they were discussed.

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mr. Andy Perez, Committee Chairperson greeted those present, and thanked them for coming and he noted as well that more Board members were expected.

Mr. Perez began with introductions: Mr. Philipp Ludwig; Mr. Tom Roth; Ms. Jackie Harder; and Dr. Donna Jennings, and the staff present introduced themselves as well.

2. Approval of EDIS Committee Meeting Minutes

A. June 18, 2009

B. August 19, 2009

C. October 14, 2009

Mr. Perez noted that a quorum had not yet been achieved the minutes could not be approved, although a quorum is expected.

Mr. Perez reviewed the status of several items within the minutes. This was done in preparation for the SFWIB meeting the next day.

Mr. Perez requested an update on the Knight Center digital excellence literacy survey. Staff responded that the agreement was sent off to Miami Broadband, Kim, and she had not returned it at the moment. It was sent prior to Thanksgiving, and staff is waiting for it to be signed.

Mr. Perez requested an update on the allocation of \$50,000 to the Greater Miami Chamber for educational workforce challenges for Miami-Dade County. Mr. Beasley, SFWIB Executive Director, responded that it had been finalized, although there still are some questions to be answered. Mr. Beasley noted that he would be meeting with Barry Johnson to answer those questions.

Mr. Perez requested a brief overview of the training expo. Mr. Beasley asked staff person, Mr. Juan Hernandez to report.

Mr. Hernandez reported that so far in addition to the information that was shared at the last committee meeting, there are two attachments that will be shared with the Members. And the vouchers were broken down by training program, and by training agent. He reported that the final total was about 520.

Mr. Perez asked Ms. Harder to discuss with staff regarding setting up the training expo in Monroe County. Ms. Harder responded that she would actually be interested to do a techno expo approach to this rather than strictly as a training expo. She asked who her SFWIB staff person would be. Mr. Beasley responded that the staff person would be Cheri Kavehersi.

Mr. Perez informed the Committee he and staff have been diligently having discussions with the training providers and staff to provide accountability to this Region. Training providers with SFWIB contracts must communicate with SAMS, which is the back-end software for entering information regarding individuals that have received services through the workforce system. To that end a meeting with the training providers was held recently and reports and some of the policy recommendations were reviewed. This committee will continue to work with the training providers to update the training policies and procedures.

Mr. Perez asked for an update on the Employed Worker Training project for the Parrot Jungle. Mr. Beasley responded that it was off the ground, and they're doing the training. They've trained one group and are moving on to the next group. In addition, we did actually get a picture and an article we provided to them in the Journal.

[Monica Russo arrived. Quorum achieved.]

Mr. Perez noted that although the quorum had been achieved he would complete the review of the minutes and then request a motion to approve.

Mr. Perez reported that item 12, the Digital Divide project is a project that Executive Director Rick Beasley and he had worked on diligently. He also had informed the state of this project and the chairman of the state is pushing extremely hard to have this implemented and copied statewide. This is a great example of hard work being picked up at the local level and then having it reflected at the state level. What is the status?

Mr. Beasley: reported that the signed contract was just received, and we will now get the PCs switched out and moved over.

Mr. Perez asked for a report on the technology upgrade action. Mr. Beasley responded that Mr. Perez had been pushing E-learning vouchers at the state level on and we are getting this off the ground as Elevate Miami. The City Commission approved the request to accept the money. We

are finalizing everything there. The State of Florida has received about 35,000 E-learning vouchers and Mr. Perez has been working on that component.

Mr. Perez reported an update on that item. He noted that this Region was to get a large portion the 35,000 vouchers that were going to be allocated to the State of Florida by Microsoft. He made a suggestion to really look at the poverty level as a determination of how many vouchers would be received by Miami-Dade County.

Staff members at the State of Florida noticed that the City of New York received 70,000 vouchers. Now the state is asking Microsoft to bring this back to the table because the state wants an explanation for the difference. This is may be a move in this Region's favor because these are training vouchers for E-learning to provide digital literacy, as per Microsoft, which includes Word PC basic, etc. for those who do not now have access. The same system used by Elevate Miami will be used. Because of the investment of funds from this Region as well as the vouchers that we are going to be receiving we are going to be able to serve a considerable number of people.

He continued to note that this item is similar to item 6, the digital divide project. On that project Per Scholas will refurbish PCs, and with the small investment from South Florida Workforce, we will expect to serve 405 families with refurbished computers, Internet access, and training by Per Scholas, a not-for-profit organization.

Ms. Harder commented that this project would have great applicability to Monroe County as well, and Monroe County would be expecting a share of the 70,000 vouchers.

Mr. Perez responded that those decisions would be made by staff and that Monroe County would receive their share.

Mr. Beasley commented that Mr. Perez has been working diligently trying to get the state staff to understand our region. We are the State's biggest region, and they were going to focus strictly on rural areas. We have Monroe County, which is a rural area, and the State replied that they consider Monroe County as a part of Miami.

Mr. Perez then asked me what I think about this idea of poverty. That would work for us. That breakdown would then give us 9,000 of the E-learning vouchers. Mr. Beasley noted that Mr. Perez is the one to thank for being vigilant at the State level.

Mr. Perez responded that the decision is not really based by region, but by county, and there are many more counties than Workforce Regions. This is a huge portion of vouchers based on the poverty level. We are also focusing on the un-employment number, which is at 11.8 percent.

Ms. Harder expressed concern that there would be some issues on both of those scores in Monroe County because the un-employment levels are not that high.

Mr. Beasley responded that the funds would come to the Region, and permission could be requested from the State. This would assist "baby boomers" who want to be re-trained in computers, and here is a way for us to do that now. We wouldn't distribute the funds just to Miami-Dade County.

Ms. Harder added that the state rural areas of economic concern, does not include Monroe County, so we are neither fish nor fowl when it comes to the official legislative designation of rural.

Mr. Perez responded that as soon as we get that final number and it's allocated, please I invite you to work with staff to get some of that down there.

Mr. Ludwig had a comment on item 6. We have had some discussions with staff regarding the applicability or the ability to replicate what was being done with the career center PCs with the larger corporations across the county. Unfortunately, as it applies to Baptist Health, we seem to max out the use of these PCs, stretch them out as far as possible. And that I think was not a very good example. There is a point where it is not worth refurbishing PCs, but I would want to encourage us to look further to see if we can multiply the use of used PCs.

Mr. Beasley responded that the idea from Mr. Ludwig who called the next day to say that there might be an opportunity. So I reached out to a number of Board members, including Dr. Jennings. Dr. Jennings responded that Miami-Dade College is not permitted to donate anything that has any value at all, but they are able to give us a nice price for PCs, and we could pick them up. Miami-Dade College is not permitted to donate.

I then spoke to Mr. Fred Marinelli and we tried to work out the process with the City of Hialeah. We did pick up some PCs from Great Florida Bank. I contacted Monroe County to please donate PCs. We talked to the mayor's office about PCs with the county. My understanding is that they really put PCs into surplus.

Mr. Perez requested staff to track these items so that a press release could be distributed, and he would forward the information to the State.

In response to a question from Dr. Jennings responded that staff is still dealing with the original 405 PCs received and trying to get those distributed. There were some difficulties with the Internet, but I believe that we have that worked out. The bigger problem is the recipients without a phone line in their homes. Most have cell phones and not phone lines. Mr. Perez suggested staff contact cell phone providers to see if they could provide air cards that are used with laptops, which are available for desk top PCs, as well.

Mr. Perez commented on item 8, the RN nursing scholarship program. This was collaboration with the University of Miami hospital and Miami-Dade College, and I believe the start date is in January. Mr. Beasley added that the recruitment, as well as the eligibility was being completed.

Mr. Perez noted that the review of the minutes had concluded and he requested a motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Roth asked whether a Member could vote on the minutes if the Member was not present at the meeting in question. Mr. Beasley indicated that yes, a Member could vote on the minutes even if the Member were not present at the meeting.

Ms. Monica Russo moved approval of the June 18, 2009, August 19, 2009, and October 14, 2009 minutes. The motion was seconded by Philipp Ludwig and approved.

3. Recommendation as to Approval of an Occupational Training Supply/Demand Policy

Mr. Beasley presented the item, and following that he asked if there were any questions. He reminded the Members that when the TOL data is compiled, the information might come from economic developers, or training providers, or businesses. The purpose of the TOL is to determine where training funds should be directed and to help decide the availability in our system.

Mr. Roth asked how staff arrived at this policy and Mr. Beasley replied that staff had been trying to change the policy to a more systematic process including criteria. This way you know specifically what we must consider to determine which trainings to fund.

Mr. Perez that as Mr. Beasley reports we have not really looked at accountability as a benchmark and whether an actual need exists for the training. This is based on projections from LMI for this region from 2009-2017.

Mr. Roth asked for an example. Mr. Beasley explained by using the example of claims adjusters, examiners and investigators.

Mr. Beasley explained that three darkened boxes indicated a failing occupation so it would not be funded training. The proposed policy would be the occupation on a one year moratorium for training, and we would take a look at it again at some point. For the occupations in red the policy wouldn't apply to those because they are in particular targeted industries that we're going to focus on.

Mr. Roth commented that with 39 people there are a lot of people per job out there who can fill this position. So why focus training on that. Versus the one above it you only have 2.08 on purchasing agents so we need to get more people to line up with available jobs. Mr. Beasley responded that it focuses our attention and our resources to meet the demand for this region. Mr. Perez offered that it also allows staff to focus their energies. This is another policy to help staff manage and place accountability on schools when it comes to performance.

Ms. Harder expressed her concern that the benchmark numbers were determined arbitrarily.

Mr. Beasley explained that staff used the total number of what was available in the system, and the total number in training. They then took the total number of jobs that are roughly available, and came up with that benchmark for this list here for Region 23. This was how we arrived at the cut-off point.

Mr. Beasley noted that some occupations are in red for which there are no training programs. Mr. Perez added that these training programs that are listed here the TOL, typically are linked to several occupations, not just one. The elimination of a single occupation doesn't mean we're eliminating the program. All the occupations that are being served by that one program would need to be eliminated, if that were the case. Again we're just trying to eliminate wasteful spending.

Ms. Harder noted that she would rather go with high growth high wage. She also added that in addition to cutting back on those programs for which there's no demand we should actively seek people who are can provide those jobs. Mr. Beasley responded that not all employers post their jobs on Employ Florida, which is the state job bank, and because we are the labor exchange for the state, this is our system.

Mr. Beasley explained the process of suppressing a job order. Without that job order that means this Region is missing a number of job orders that could be used to calculate this, and how we are funded. We are not connected with Monster, or Expedia, or other job banks.

Mr. Roth commented that he did not want to sound like a statistician, but having just gone over this with his son studying the fifth grade math and mean versus median. Listening to what you said it is a sort of arbitrary number but it seems like a median is probably more appropriate because half the respondents are above and half are below. So I don't know if we're trying to eliminate more than not. Because if you use average that's going to happen. If you look at all the darkened boxes on here that's because we used the average. If you're using median it's 50%. So first confirm with staff if this is an average and not a median.

Mr. Beasley responded that it is an average. It is what we have for the targeted number of jobs, the number of jobs that are listed on our system here. Not just for the TOL. It's an entire list of what's been projected for the labor market information for this region.

For the 3.06 we took the number of jobs that we have here. We added that to the 1,549 and divided it by the number of jobs roughly available: 7,421. Then we took the two sums divided by a sum to get the 3.06.

Mr. Roth noted that the result is we're getting a lot more dark boxes than light boxes as a result of that methodology. Ms. Harder asked if we were to change that would it change these numbers significantly.

Mr. Beasley responded yes this becomes an average if you get to the benchmark. But keep in mind we have a surplus of people and we're using the dollars to train for a demand, and not for the surplus.

Mr. Roth noted that the median might be considered instead of an average. You might re-run this as a median and see what that does to your boxes. But again I'm not sure if the goal is to get more of them off the list or on the list, or...

Mr. Beasley responded that there must be criteria to determine what programs we will train for and those we will not, given our limited resources.

Mr. Ludwig offered that beyond reducing or increasing the list the philosophical question we have to ask ourselves: we have a limited pool funds do we want to spread it over 50% of the jobs or do we want to spread it on less and provide more. That's another question.

Mr. Roth asked where we would want to come out. Do we want to come out where more than 50% are eliminated, or more targeted, then mean or average is the right way to use it.

Mr. Beasley responded that it really wouldn't make a bit of difference. It's really the policy which would give us the basis to look at the supply demand rate to determine which programs are necessary for this community. That's the policy.

Mr. Perez noted that this committee is the one to set that policy so if you want to use the average then we use the average. If you want to use the mean, then we use the mean.

Ms. Harder commented that, as Mr. Roth pointed out it would be a great idea to run the numbers again using the median to see what the result is. And again, to sound like a broken record, at the retreat we had two years ago, where we talked about and focused on high growth. If we don't have an educated workforce will not be able to attract the kind industries that we need. My recommendation would be to focus on high wage, high growth.

Mr. Perez reminded that there are other sources of funds that people can tap in to go to school. Workforce is just not, as Executive Director, Rick Beasley always says, workforce is just not the only resource that someone can tap into if they want to become a pilot, let's say. And secondly, if we're just going to focus on high wage and high growth I believe we're going to eliminate a lot of the population that would need to build up to get into that high wage, high growth job, the hardest to serve for instance.

Mr. Perez explained the for instance, someone in the hardest to serve population might not have had the background to get into an occupation in health. If we eliminate low wage, low growth jobs like say Certified Nursing Assistant (CAN) that person might not move up to a high wage, high growth

job. Ms. Harder agreed that it's a growth path, but if he's coming in as a server and he wants to be a registered nurse why wouldn't you want to fund that. Mr. Beasley responded that because it may depend on the aptitude of the person applying to enter that occupation. I remember Ms. Regueiro making the comment that you may have individuals whose aptitude does not allow them to go for the IT job or go for the nursing job. If the low wage, low growth occupations are eliminated; such as the CEA which is the certified development child certification; and the CNA, which is the certified nursing assistant those pathways to high wage, high growth jobs would be eliminated.

Mr. Beasley suggested that we choose high wage because some individuals may not have the aptitude to go for the high wage jobs initially, and we may need to start them somewhere else first.

Ms. Harder responded that she understood, and she objected. She noted that she did not believe it is up to us to decide who's got the aptitude.

Mr. Beasley noted that what I was sharing was a comment from one of our Board members that was made when we created the chart. The same argument that you've making here is the same argument I was made as well. At the time the comment came back that you should just focus on the high wage, high growth. I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm trying to be the devil's advocate and I don't have a problem one way or the other. We want to focus our attention on high growth high wage because for long term we know that they're going to produce for us. You know it all depends on the economy.

I think your initiative is to focus on the high wage because even if it's low growth, it's still a high wage. And we may have emerging industries, emerging occupations, that really we haven't determined as of yet. So it is still low growth, but it is high wage, so we want to focus on high wage occupations, but we know some people are not going to start off at the high end.

Ms. Harder added that that was what she meant, and thanked the Committee for indulging her.

Mr. Perez recapped by noting it appeared that the consensus of this committee is that we are requesting staff to provide a report on the calculation of the median and a report on the calculation of the average using the same data.

Mr. Perez asked the Committee members when they would want to see the reports. Mr. Ludwig commented that they could be compiled into a list that needn't be extensive, but rather just sums.

Mr. Beasley commented that I wanted to make sure you saw all of the data. From a policy perspective you're saying we can use the average or we can use the median, but here's how we're going to determine what programs we're going to train for.

Mr. Roth noted that it looks like we're using the average now because we're eliminating more programs. We're probating more programs than we would if we were using the median. If that is more expedient, or that works for you, that should be an option for you.

Ms. Harder requested that the chart would read better in color and requested that the type size to be increased, or bolded.

Mr. Perez clarified that staff is to provide the median as well as the average number for comparison and bring it to tomorrow's meeting if possible. If we need further discussion, then we will do so.

4. Recommendation as to Approval of a SFWIB Training Vendor Performance Chargeback Policy

Mr. Beasley presented the item.

Mr. Perez commented that any program that's below 70 percent is not in compliance with the agreement that they have with this region. So the focus of this policy is to request monies to be returned to this region because of the non-compliance, and once we get to this point this program is pretty much not going to be funded in the future. The 25 percent comes from the tuition of individuals who have failed not all students.

Mr. Beasley noted that the determining factors are completion of the program and/or placement. Mr. Perez added that the Case Manager is the middle person between the school and the region, and that individual will verify that this person completed the class as well as inputting the information into SAMS as well as perform an employer check to see if the person is working.

Mr. Carlos Manrique commented that he asks the Committee to bifurcate this item with item eight that I requested of the Chairman to put on the agenda.

Mr. Manrique took the floor and made many comments regarding the issue of whether or not SFWIB has or has not a refund policy in place, and the amount refunded to SFWIB.

As he has been a Board member for about 12 years, he knew this Board did not have a policy. He previously requested and received information through a public records request. Thirty-five pages of information were received dating back to 2004. He noted that during that time SFWIB had spent \$135million dollars on training.

Mr. Manrique disagreed that SFWIB has a return policy, and disagreed with the amount of funds returned to SFWIB.

Mr. Beasley noted that Mr. Manrique was presenting information in a public meeting and you have provided no documentation to the Members. Staff had previously requested the documentation. Mr. Manrique responded that he had submitted the information to Mr. Beasley on January 6, 2009.

Mr. Beasley noted that staff reviewed the information with your staff and some of the information in the analysis is not accurate. We agreed to go through the information with your staff any time we to bring it back for analysis. In addition which Mr. Beasley shared with Mr. Manrique, this item would not be presented to the full Board because the Chairman wants it discussed in this committee.

There followed extensive heated discussion.

[Ms. Russo left the meeting. There was no longer a quorum.]

Mr. Perez expressed concern that a quorum had now been lost.

The discussion continued.

Mr. Perez informed Mr. Manrique that as Chair of this Committee he reports to the Chairman of this Board, and requested that Mr. Manrique provide this information to the Chairman and then he would determine how it would be distributed to the Board.

Mr. Manrique responded that Mr. Beasley has a copy which he could give to you. You don't need it from me. Mr. Perez clarified that he is requesting the findings, not the documents provided to him from Mr. Beasley.

Mr. Manrique commented that he does not have the answer to fix the problem, but I am saying that this is a very large problem. Which is the lack of a return policy by this Board, and right now a training provider keeps all the money whether that person stayed a day or completed. .

[Mr. Manrique refused to yield the floor to the Chair. The Chair attempted to recognize another Member, and Mr. Manrique questioned that, and the Chair responded that Mr. Manrique was not requesting recognition from the Chair to speak. Mr. Manrique apologized.]

Mr. Beasley reported that the policy was approved by an older Board, and the policy is to recognize all the refund policies of every school. That is the policy, and that was the information that was provided to Mr. Manrique in the request.

Mr. Beasley also noted that we sent information to him as a result of a public information request. He has commented that all records had not been provided. The other information was not provided because it would have required going to Iron Mountain which would be a lengthy and costly process. Mr. Manrique then chose not to pay for the extra information that he wanted.

Mr. Perez commented that he was very appreciative that this issue was brought up, but he wanted to see the information, and distribute it to the Committee. There followed discussion as to how the information could be received and distributed.

Mr. Beasley reminded the members that the Chairman wanted the item to be vetted through the committee process, which it should be.

Mr. Manrique again asked whether SFWIB has a return policy and discussion followed, including staff member, Ken Kistner's description of the policy: It's the refund policy of each of the schools. In addition every school is required by the Commission for Independent Education, Florida, are governed by that and those refund policies are applicable to every school, whether the student is a workforce student, or a Pell student or another type of student. And if the person is a Pell eligible student, then all the Pell rules apply. It's all spelled out in the law.

Mr. Manrique commented that his point was made with the intention to make it better.

Mr. Perez explained that there is a need to educate the current Members of what happened in the past so that it may be corrected. Mr. Manrique responded that his purpose is nothing more than to have a policy that is approved by this Board.

Mr. Perez commented that the State of Florida, under the Commission of Independent Education, which is a subsidiary of the Department of Education, requires holding a public license and serving the public that an organization must have a refund policy stated in the enrollment agreement. From my understanding as Chairman of the EDIS Committee and in the history of my business with workforce, this Board has adopted that statute. That is my understanding. Mr. Manrique responded that they all have different policies. In fact by the information request you will see different policies.

Dr. Jennings noted that the refund policy in private schools is directed to students, not to the provider.

Mr. Roth noted that he was confused, but now the information has been clarified.

Mr. Manrique commented that Items 4 and 8 should be re-written as one item. He also added that this could be a million dollar problem, and SFWIB has not enforced the refund policy. He added the recommendation that this item not be passed as written.

Mr. Perez asked for a consensus. There was a request for a compilation of the refund policies for all the training vendors, as well as a group of public providers and non-providers to convene to review the policy(ies).

Ms. Harder would like to see a compilation the refund policies of all the training vendors. We should have a standardized policy for our providers and she also would agree that a non-aligned committee to review this would be good. The first part is to see what is there now.

Mr. Perez asked if anyone had read number 5.

Mr. Ludwig agreed with Ms. Harder that a uniform policy, a call back on the education fees, and he would like to see what is the current situation before any determination is made.

Mr. Beasley noted that he had already requested that staff review the schools and provide a list of those schools by program, which were failing.

Mr. Roth agreed that this item should be tabled. It is too premature to bring it to the Board the next day.

Mr. Manrique asked if the Members could share what information should appear on the report.

Mr. Perez responded that staff would accept the information Mr. Manrique will provide and then disperse the information to the Committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Manrique asked how far back to go for the information and Mr. Perez asked committee whether 2004-2009 was a sufficient time frame. Mr. Manrique added that there must be a review of every training provider who received any funds from SFWIB since 2004. Also necessary is how many students have completed and how many students have been placed in a job. This includes public and private schools.

Mr. Perez granted the request back to only 2005, from the present.

Mr. Manrique asked how much training dollars are remaining. Mr. Beasley noted that the Centers do not have funds to enroll any new individuals into the program, although they have funding for those already in the program. They may be out of WIA, but they should have some TANF funds. The ARRA dollars are used for the DTA.

Ms. Harder asked whether the data would be compiled by staff, and not Mr. Manrique, who has a dog in this fight. Mr. Perez responded in the affirmative. Ms. Harder also noted that she was interested in all of the expenditures, not just those that are failing. She requests to see what everybody looks like.

Mr. Beasley responded that the report would be prepared, and it would also be online.

Dr. Jennings asked should the training providers not expect any new training referrals. Mr. Beasley said I'm not saying that, because he did not know. If they use regular WIA funds there may not be any referrals, if there are no resources, but using ARRA funds there may be referrals.

It was the consensus of the Members present to table item 4.

5. Recommendation as to Approval of a Standardized Refund Policy Guideline

Mr. Ludwig agreed with Ms. Harder that a uniform policy, a call back on the education fees, and he would like to see what is the current situation.

Mr. Roth commented that the item should not be brought to the Board the next day because it was too premature.

It was the consensus of the Members present to table item 5.

6. Recommendation as to Approval of New Training Agents and New Programs for Existing Training Agents

There was consensus of the Members present to forward this item to the full Board.

Mr. Perez requested that freeze any applications for any new schools until the refund issue is taken care of. Staff is being inundated by new schools, which takes resources from staff.

Mr. Manrique noted there might be a field on the chart, but no provider, and that could be brought to the Board as a sole source provider.

Mr. Manrique noted that he felt that he was not the right person to speak on this issue.

Ms. Harder agreed and that she was uncomfortable that Mr. Manrique brought the subject up because he is an educational provider.

Mr. Perez was looking at it from a business point of view. Mr. Manrique noted that Mr. Perez' company is top notch. Nothing personal.

Mr. Perez commented that this information was brought on December 16, 2009, if this has been an issue since 2002. Mr. Manrique noted that it was brought to the attention in January of 2009 and Mr. Beasley was not the Executive Director then. Mr. Beasley commented that he was the Executive Director then.

It was the consensus of the Members present to move the item to the full Board.

7. Discussion – Revision to Student Support Fee

Staff has done an audit of all the services provided by Miami Dade College and Miami-Dade County Public Schools requested by the Committee at the last meeting regarding a separate voucher that pays for service fees. All schools receive the service fee, and it is included in the full voucher. All providers receive the service fee.

Mr. Beasley noted that this item was brought up about a year ago by Mr. Manrique when he requested a reduction his service fee. He offered to reduce the fee by \$75.

Mr. Perez asked Mr. Manrique if he had anything to add. Mr. Manrique noted that at that time the economy was stronger. The reduction was submitted one and a half years ago. We charge \$100 because we do not charge time and attendance as we deal with adults. The schools system and the college do not work the same way. Their costs could be more than the schools.

Dr. Jennings noted that nothing has changed and the \$200 does not cover the costs that the college incurs. The survey while interesting, I do not understand how the results help because the bottom line is what the college provides above and beyond.

Mr. Perez asked of Juan Hernandez, of the charges to public and private, are they delivering. Dr. Jennings noted that at the last Board meeting there was a report.

Mr. Perez asked Mr. Hernandez if we are getting a return on investment on the \$200 fee. Dr. Jennings added that the \$200 is linked to the college. Everyone pays the fee, although the college

itemizes that fee. Mr. Hernandez responded that 17 of the 36 training providers responded, and of those the percentage of services provided was 61% to 75% of the services.

The \$200 fee is included in the methodology. If that were taken out it would affect all training providers.

Mr. Perez, as Chair, he will present the information and let Ms. Harder and Mr. Roth decide the action to take.

Mr. Manrique suggested that this study could be included in the refund policy report.

Mr. Beasley noted that the OMB circular requires that the amount must be reasonable and is it beyond what we typically what we do for someone else.

Mr. Manrique clarified. The schools are regulated by the legislature. Our cost is free. If you're a private school and you teach what Miami Dade College (MDC) and the Dade County Public Schools (DCPS) teach, the private schools received 10% more than what is published by the legislature to do some of these things. If the workforce board requires MDC or DCPS to do more than what you would normally do, you may request a fee.

In 2002 MDC and DCPS came together and the fees were \$200 to get all this information that we do not provide our students and that the privates receive 10% more than MDC and DCPS.

He added that MDC charges by the semester and receives the full amount up front. DCPS only receives the \$200 fee per student. That is what needs to be reviewed.

Mr. Beasley commented that since the Chair recused himself, and there were only two Members to consider the item, and there were other items to be discussed at the next meeting, this might not be the time to take this to the full Board.

The question was what information you want. If we do not have enough information for an item we should not take it to the Board.

Ms. Harder asked for information on what has changed since 2002, and what the cost of delivering these services to our providers is.

Mr. Perez offered that it should also be linked with performance because when the service fee is paid, you want a return on investment.

Mr. Roth suggested creating some performance-based standards, and Mr. Beasley noted that the current standards are 70% completion and 70% placement.

Mr. Beasley requested information on what the Committee wants.

Mr. Beasley noted that Ms. Harder also wanted the refund policies of every school, and Ms. Harder confirmed.

8. Discussion – SFWIB Training Voucher Refund Policy

It was the consensus of the Members present to table item 8.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 P.M.



2.

SFWIB - Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee

April 14, 2010

Minutes of SFWIB Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee Meeting February 17, 2010

South Florida Workforce Investment Board
 Economic Development and Industry Sector Committee and Workforce Committee
 February 17, 2010, 3:00 P.M.
 South Florida Workforce Headquarters
 7300 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
 Miami, FL 33126

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE	OTHER BOARD MEMBERS	OTHER ATTENDEES
10. Andre “Andy” Perez - <i>Chair</i> 11. Ludwig, Phillip 12. Regueiro, Maria Cristina 13. Roth, Thomas COMMITTEE MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE 14. Brecheisen, Bruce 15. Diggs, Bill 16. Harder, Jackie, <i>Vice Chair</i> 17. Russo, Monica 18. Wiedman, Holly	Jennings, Dr. Donna Manrique, Carlos SFW STAFF Beasley, Rick Kavehersi, Cheri Edwards, Phillip Glancy, Anne Gomez, Maria Hernandez, Juan Malave, Gus Parodi, Silvio Santis, Liz	Costas, Jorge – <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Girnun, Arnie – <i>New Horizons</i> Marino, Nayibe – <i>American Advanced Technicians Institute (AATI)</i> Marti, Sergio – <i>Miami-Dade County Public Schools</i> Milian, Dalia – <i>City of Hialeah</i> Milian, Delia - <i>City of Hialeah</i> Olorunnipa, Toluse – <i>Miami Herald</i>

Agenda items are displayed in the order they were discussed.

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mr. Andy Perez, Committee Chairperson greeted those present at 3:15 pm , and thanked them for coming and noted that the quorum had not yet been achieved.

8. Information – Florida Back to Work Program

[Mr. Roth arrived.]

There followed much discussion regarding when funds could be expended.

Mr. Rick Beasley, Executive Director noted that the Department of Health and Human Services had not rendered a decision, and the State had not yet approved the proposed projects. Mr. Perez added that employers would not be hired until the funds are approved.

Mr. Carlos Manrique asked why SFW funds could not be used now.

Mr. Beasley noted in response to a question from Dr. Donna Jennings, that the information was disseminated through SFW providers as well as through some Chambers of Commerce.

Ms. Maria Regueiro requested that a message be sent to SFWIB Members when a project like this arises, and Mr. Beasley replied that it would be done.

Mr. Perez commented that Florida Back to Work is a reimbursement program.

Mr. Manrique asked how the employers were selected and how the information was verified, and was the information on the SFW web page. He also added that many on the list have backgrounds that the State might not approve. He asked what the employers' commitment is.

Mr. Perez replied that the commitment is declared by the employer. The employers would not hire until the funds are approved. Mr. Manrique asked people could be employed right away using available TANF funds. Mr. Beasley replied that service providers could use TABF funds, if available, but the projects must be approved by the State first.

Ms. Regueiro asked where to get more info on the projects. Mr. Beasley responded that local information is on the SFW webpage.

Mr. Manrique noted that TANF participants, or those with a child, many times have a background that may not permit them to be hired. Mr. Perez commented that it would be up to the employer whether or not to hire.

9. Information – Region 23 Preliminary 2010-2011 TOL

Mr. Beasley presented the item. SFW sent requests for information to training providers, economic developers, and chambers of commerce. The deadline to submit our information is March first.

10. Information – Workforce Estimating Conference

Mr. Beasley presented the item and noted that the SFW workforce estimating conference was scheduled for February 25th at 9:00am for the EDIS Committee to review and approve the data submitted so that it may be entered into the system.

Mr. Perez noted that an e-mail message had been sent to SFWIB training providers to inform them of the occupations considered for removal. Mr. Beasley noted that 23-27 occupations had been removed. Information that would keep those occupations on the list must be submitted prior to February 25th.

Dr. Jennings suggested that coordination in the future and sharing of documentation could be scheduled in advance. Mr. Beasley noted that the list was received with a short turn-around time.

Mr. Perez noted that there had not yet been a quorum achieved and the minutes could not be approved.

3. Recommendation as to Approval of an Occupational Training Supply/Demand Policy

Mr. Beasley presented the item. Mr. Roth noted that there was quite a difference, and added that if the intention is to reduce the list, then use the average. Mr. Beasley responded that the decision is up to the Members. Mr. Perez added that it was a policy recommendation to curb those training providers not producing.

Mr. Tom Roth, Mr. Philipp Ludwig, and Ms. Maria Regueiro agreed that the median was the way to go.

It was the consensus of the Members present to recommend the use of the median and forward the item to the full Board.

4. Recommendation as to Approval of a New Training Agent and New Programs for an Existing Training Agent

Mr. Beasley presented the item concerning Florida Educational Institute, Inc., and Professional Training Centers, Inc.

Mr. Manrique asked why SFW would include an entity that is not accredited. There followed discussion regarding accreditation, the length of time in this market, whether the organizations had already graduated a class, and whether they are accredited or certified.

Ms. Regueiro noted that the institution must be accredited to receive Title IV funding, but the institution does not need to be accredited, but does need to be licensed by the Department of Education.

There followed discussion regarding the ability for a graduate to attain work in a medical field if the course were not accredited. Mr. Beasley noted that the issue had not before been raised, and SFW has no such policy in place at this time. Mr. Perez commented that it was never required that the school be accredited for a medical assistant degree.

Mr. Perez requested that the issue be discussed when a quorum is present.

Ms. Regueiro noted that the issue is very complex. Small institutions start and must be in business several years before they are permitted to apply for accreditation. In the meantime they offer their services to workforce regions. The focus is on graduates and whether they are placed in a job, and there is no portability, although they still meet the criteria of the State of Florida.

Mr. Ludwig asked whether there was a pressing need to approve this item.

Ms. Regueiro noted that the Members of the Board are here to review items presented and give comments based on their expertise, and to forward to the full Board if there is consensus to do so.

Mr. Roth commented that the item should be moved to the full Board as it meets the present standards.

Mr. Ludwig requested a formal review by the subcommittee.

It was the consensus of the Members present to find available dates to meet regarding the requirements to be considered a training vendor for South Florida Workforce.

5. Recommendation as to Approval of an EDIS Subcommittee

Mr. Beasley presented the item.

Mr. Ludwig agreed with Ms. Harder that a uniform policy, a call back on the education fees, and he would like to see what is the current situation.

It was the consensus of the Members present that Mr. Andy Perez had a conflict and a subcommittee would be created to discuss and review SFWIB training policies and report through the EDIS Committee to the full Board.

6. Discussion – Training Vendors’ Refund Policies

Mr. Beasley presented the item, and brought to the Member’s attention the refund policies of the current training providers included as an attachment to the item.

7. Discussion – Training Vendors’ Performance

Mr. Beasley presented the item and noted that there was still data not yet in the system. He informed the Members that letters would be sent to the training providers to provide the information

and verification of the data in SAMS to SFW. If the data is not satisfactorily submitted, the training provider could be dropped from SFW.

[Maria Regueiro left the meeting.]

Mr. Beasley provided an overhead presentation. He noted that in many cases, there is a completion entered, but there is no reason given. Some have the reason entered, but no completion. He added that the Service Providers and Training Providers must reconcile information on a monthly basis.

Mr. Ludwig used one training provider as an example and noted that the information indicated that information for four trainees was missing.

Mr. Beasley noted that the item was not being forwarded to the full Board at the next day's meeting.

Mr. Carlos Manrique inquired as to whether refunds had been received from the providers for students who dropped out.

Dr. Jennings inquired as to reasons that a training provider might be dropped. Mr. Beasley responded that the training providers must meet 70% completion and 70% placement rates.

Mr. Perez questioned how a private training provider would issue a refund to SFW as opposed to a public training provider.

Mr. Manrique inquired why a refund policy was not yet in place. Mr. Beasley responded that meetings after meetings delayed the process.

Mr. Beasley noted that SFW went over the information with training providers prior to the action, and Mr. Manrique's staff was present at that meeting.

Mr. Perez commented that it took 20 to 25 meetings to change the policy on high wage, high skill, etc.

He added that SFW was now about to verify that the information in the system is correct, which has not been completed since 2002. The service providers and training providers have not properly entered information into the system.

Letters would be sent including a deadline to enter data into the system.

Mr. Beasley noted that there had been many conversions of data over the years.

Mr. Perez noted that SFW must have all information necessary in order to make sound decisions.

Mr. Manrique noted that the SFWIB is a policy board and the members are here to offer advice and he added that he reports to the Superintendent of Miami-Dade County Public Schools, and they are not just a training provider.

Mr. Manrique spoke for some time regarding the lack of a SFW refund policy for which he had sent letters to SFW for one year, which might have saved SFW millions and millions of dollars.

He did credit Mr. Perez's chairmanship of the committee.

Mr. Perez commented that the quadrant chart (High Skill / High Wage and Low Skill / Low wage) had been torpedoed after a letter from Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) indicating that it would injure MDCPS.

Mr. Ludwig requested that the discussion return to the topic at hand and asked what the timeline would be. Mr. Beasley responded that it is ready to go, and staff is just waiting for the information.

Mr. Beasley added that letters would be sent to schools for which programs are not in compliance and would be given 30 days to comply. Mr. Ludwig asked what would happen if the numbers do not match up and Mr. Beasley replied that those schools would also be notified.

2. Approval of EDIS Committee Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2010

Mr. Perez noted that as the quorum had not been achieved, the minutes were not approved.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.



3.

SFWIB – Economic Development & Industry Sector (EDIS) Committee

April 14, 2010

Training Providers Performance Reporting Requirements

Informational Item

BACKGROUND

On March 19, 2010, SFWIB sent letters via certified mail to its approved training providers regarding performance reporting requirements. The letter explained that federal law (as seen in WIA Funds Title I, Part 660 – Subpart E, Section 663.510) prescribes that regional workforce boards conduct performance reviews related to completion of trainings, credentials attained, placements, training-related placements and cost analysis for approved training vendor programs. Additionally, the letter communicated that a SFWIB ITA Agent Performance Reporting Requirements Policy was approved by a predecessor Board on April 23, 2003.

According to the Performance Reporting Requirements Policy, a SFWIB training provider's program must satisfy a 70 percent completion and entered employment rate as well as a 70 percent training-related placement rate. For training vendors carrying multiple programs, each program must satisfy that policy. Programs failing the Performance Reporting standards are slated for removal from the SFWIB approved programs list.

Each training provider that received a letter was afforded 30 calendar days from receipt of the letter to provide documentation showing that the program(s) slated for removal satisfy the Performance Reporting Requirements Policy. If the documentation is deemed acceptable by SFWIB staff, the program(s) at issue will remain on the list of approved SFWIB programs and thus eligible for ITA issuance.



4.

SFWIB - Economic Development & Industry Sector (EDIS) Committee

April 14, 2010

Employed Worker Training Program Update

Informational Item

BACKGROUND

In January 2007, SFWIB launched its Employed Worker Training Program (EWT) to assist regional businesses in upgrading the skills of their workforce. Through EWT, SFWIB reimburses qualifying businesses a maximum of 50 percent of the total training costs involved in enhancing the skills of their employees.

At its June 18, 2009, meeting, the SFWIB passed the budget for program year 2009-2010, allocating \$500,000.00 for EWT projects.

The attached chart provides a summary of EWT projects as of April 1, 2010.

Attachment

Summary of EWTP Projects

Company Name	Funds Awarded - Appropriated from SFW Pool (\$500,000.00)	Training Area(s) Provided	# of Employees to be trained	Average Wage	Total Number Trained	Service Partner Requesting Funds	Cost Per Trainee	Remaining Balance from the SFW EWTP Pool - (\$500,000.00)	Approved
Bio-Nucleonics, Inc. The company is a radiopharmaceutical manufacturer. They manufacture and sell radioactive drugs used for diagnostic and therapeutic treatments.	\$ 11,100.00	FDA required training and handling of radiopharmaceuticals	8	\$ 31.00		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 1,387.50	\$ 488,900.00	Sep-09
C&R Metals, Inc.- The company is a full fabrication shop working in industrial, construction, interior designs and all types of applications for commercial design clients.	\$ 900.00	AutoCAD	2	\$ 17.00		Ser Jobs	\$ 450.00	\$ 488,000.00	Sep-09
Department of Children & Family - The company is a governmental agency dedicated to providing social services to the citizens of the State of Florida.	\$ 39,075.00	Six Sigma, Project Management, Sign Language, and PHR/SPHR Training	62	\$ 23.47		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 630.24	\$ 448,925.00	Oct-09
Cheeca Holdings, LLC - The company is a full service, five star, oceanfront resort with a world class spa, multiple waterfront restaurants, a private golf course and more	\$49,500.00	Property management, Sales & Catering, Spa Module, Accounting, Retail POS, Guest eMarketing	41	\$ 17.03		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 1,207.32	\$ 399,425.00	Oct-09
Parrot Jungle and Gardens of Watson Island, Inc, dba Jungle Island - is an interactive zoological park and tourist attraction that offers camp activities, interactive animal encounters, animal shows and a tropical garden.	\$ 62,777.62	CBORD Catermate EM, BloodBourne Pathogens, Ladder Safety, Electrical Subparts S, Job Safety Analysis, Fire Protection/Prev, Standard CPR FA AED, Emergency Responce Planning/Hurricane, Defensive Driving, Safety Audits, Microsoft Certified Application Specialist (MCSA), Adobe CS 3/Photoshop Certified Expert, Project Management, Camp Counselor, Animal Training Fundamentals, SHMR/PHR	134	\$ 12.33		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 468.49	\$ 336,647.38	Oct-09
Reef Radio Electronics, Ocean Reef - is a home electronics, entertainment, automation, and computer service company in the Upper Keys and Ocean Reef.	\$ 5,000.00	Apple Hardware Service Certification, A+ Certification, Network+ Certification	5	\$ 28.00		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 331,647.38	Nov-09

Summary of EWTP Projects

Spottswood Management, Inc. - Spottswood Management, Inc. is a hospitality and property management company that provides complete management services to timeshare, hotel, marina and commercial properties.	\$ 24,107.89	Front Desk Representative, MCAS	25	\$ 16.82		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 964.32	\$ 307,539.49	Nov-09
Catholic Health Services - provides a full continuum of healthcare and services to the southeast Florida community.	\$ 26,399.00	Admit Discharge Transfer, Physicians orders, Echarting, SuperUser Training	146	\$ 23.71		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 180.82	\$ 281,140.49	Dec-09
Hilton Trading Corp. dba AccuBanker - is a suppliers of cash handling equipment (bill counters and counterfeit currency detectors).	\$ 3,293.90	OSHA / Quickbooks & SEO Toolset (Search Engine Optimization)	4	\$ 26.26		Arbor	\$ 823.48	\$ 277,846.59	Dec-09
World Emblem international, Inc. - is an industrial manufacturer of embroidered and screened printed goods and apparel.	\$ 19,512.00	OSHA, SPHR, MCAS, MCTS-SQL Server & .Net Frame	25	\$ 20.56		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 780.48	\$ 258,334.59	Jan-10
Florida Keys Mosquito Control District - was created by State statue for the purpose of evaluating, maintaining, and controlling mosquitoes in a manner that preserves and protects the ecological integrity of our scenic lands, waters and environment in the Florida Keys.	\$ 4,915.00	Introduction to Mosquito Control, Urban Pests of Importance to Public Health, Identification of Adult Mosquitos of Florida, New Technologies in Mosquito Control, Jim Robbins Food for Thought, Advanced Mosquito Control Certification, Osha Regulations for Employees and Supervisors, Equipment Roundup for Mechanics, Planning the Successful Larviciding War, Improving and Assessing Outreach Program, Introduction to GIS Technologies, Surveillance and Prediction Disease Transmission, Integrated Pest Management	20	\$ 18.79		Youth Co-Op, Inc.	\$ 245.75	\$ 253,419.59	Jan-10

Funds Awarded - Appropriated from SFW Pool (\$500,000.00)	# of Employees to be trained	Average wage	Cost Per Trainee
\$ 246,580.41	472	\$ 21.36	\$ 522.42



5.

SFWIB - Economic Development & Industry Sector (EDIS) Committee

April 14, 2010

Approval of Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, INC. using Previously Awarded Funds to Consult with Healthy Communities Institute Corporation and The Health Council of South Florida, INC. for an Education Plan

RECOMMENDATION

SFWIB staff recommends that the EDIS Committee recommend to the Board the approval of Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, INC. (GMCC) using previously awarded funds to consult with Healthy Communities Institute Corporation (a California corporation) and the Health Council of South Florida, Inc.'s Miami Matters web tool for a region-wide Education Plan.

BACKGROUND

At the August 2009 SFWIB meeting, an allocation of \$50,000.00 was approved for GMCC to collaborate with Pappas Consulting Group INC. to conduct a region-wide education and community Plan. GMCC's Education Committee proposes applying its award allocation to collaborate with Healthy Communities Institute Corporation and Health Council of South Florida, Inc.'s Miami Matters to develop new, innovative analyses and strategies for the Plan.

The GMCC Education Committee established a task force to create a living strategic Plan to unify the key stakeholders in the region's education programs. The strategic Plan will address funding resources, relevant legislation and other fundamental issues in order to provide the best educational resources for South Florida residents. In consultation with Healthy Communities Institute Corporation and the Miami Matters web tool, GMCC intends to structure a web-based education and community component to the living strategic Plan. The scope of the GMCC-Healthy Communities Institute and Miami Matters partnership encompasses gathering data from education, business and government leaders in order to improve education outcomes.

SFWIB staff recommends that the EDIS Committee recommend to the Board the use of the previously allocated funds to GMCC to collaborate with the Healthy Communities Institute Corporation and Miami Matters.