

One-Stop Task Force 070115

Mark Mattke, Del DeLaBarre, Pam Grindstaff, Katie Mirkovich, Terri Colbert, Eva Larrauri, Mark Adreon, Michael MacKilsop, Mary Houston, Tammie O'Dell, Beth Blanchard, Berit Erickson, Agnes Balassa, Theresa Stalick, Kathy Cooper

Steering Committee – four topics discussed with bearing upon work across committees:
ER Engagement, ISD – Common Intake and Career Navigator, Disadvantaged Populations, Technology/Access

- **Intake system** might be considered the single most important piece because all services flow through from that part
- However, while intake and customer flow are key, they are also subject to local area determination – the OSTF is not empowered to dictate HOW each area's customer flow works, but rather to assess HOW WELL it is serving customers
 - Examples of measures could include:
 - People are greeted within X minutes
 - Leave with a plan

Literature Review

- Recognize that there are a lot of moving parts for a one-stop operator!
 1. In WIA – a lot of measurements and language pertaining to non-native speakers, MSFWs – but populations with disabilities were not emphasized
 2. Use of Universal Access without definition – almost implied other things – need to define this term in this context
- Individuals with barriers and disabilities is needing more emphasis
- The old focus in WIA was really just ADA access

CQI, Quality Standards and How to Set and Measure?

- **Baldrige came in from DOL – part of the onerous part – so many steps**
- **Take from it what is useful and develop your own process**
- Keep our minds **organized around universal part of guidelines – the WHAT, and the HOW becomes local – due to local differences**
 - But do set the bar to which areas must work to achieve – there may be local differences in geographies and resources and some partners – but there has to be statewide standards that are intrinsic in WIOA and are transformational for the workforce system and which we need to move towards despite the discomfort/disruption it may cause
- Assess Progress towards goals
- In the absence of giving criteria / stretch goal – then folks will do what they want to - **set the Gold Standard of what our vision is to achieve and areas will fall along a continuum and describe where they are and where they are going**
- Similarities/ Differences on CQI – some use Baldrige, some leave it out
- **Feel strongly about Evidence-Based – and evaluation team must include board partners**
- Set minimum standard or criteria – must meet some minimum criteria or response to be certified
 - Our opportunity here is to have minimum that Centers will then build upon and enhance
- Questions on physical location vs. technology and degree of integration
- Move away from “Check Box” to get to qualitative assessment – the experience that people are having within the sites is most important to ascertain

Customer Feedback

- **Customer Evaluation** over years' time through the site – Job Seekers and Employers – system expectations and goals are all year long – how to glean – feedback – quick online may work better
- They're not always getting a lot back from requesting paper/pencil – SurveyMonkey a little better

- Blitz – paper/pencil evaluation – during one week – to get as many responses as possible – by site, look at satisfaction rates – set standards – 90% - and it may be harder at some sites that are smaller to get numbers
- Goal of Act is to increase services to underserved populations – how can we work together to ensure mechanisms are accessible to customers?
- Like to see that the feedback tools are appropriate for customers – their literacy levels, use of technology, language
- Technology has a place here in several ways – for example, UPS has great way of tracking packages – one-stop can track points of contact and time from last point of contact – and objectively – and at points of contact can get feedback from customer into system to act upon and improve
- **Customer-centric is key and need their input to make system better over time**

Checklists of Objective/Mandatory Elements

- **Saw commonalities – Mandatory Partners – simple Checklists**
- **Checklist is important to establish objective things are included in one-stop, then subjective questions get to other elements we are getting to**
- **Do not throw the check list out – overarching requirements – need this, this and this – then other piece is LET’S SEE THIS IN ACTION – if you are a center – need X, Y, and Z, if Affiliate, D, E, and F, etc.**
- Value of checklist – yes/no – got it or don’t – challenging part is how well you are doing it –Baldrige has been most onerous part and asking for narrative – whether we adapt or use Baldrige **we do need to demonstrate what they’re doing**
- Checklist is minimum – not having “violations” and these measure of effectiveness and outcomes is necessary – what has been achieved/ accomplished by customers – challenge is getting customers who aren’t getting good services to let us know

BUCKET - Access and Technology

- We are including different customers in our feedback – but to get to people who are barriered or ELL – **what else can we do to make things more accessible?**
- Concepts of **Universal Access** or Access Strategy – not just physical ADA access, but also internet access- resource room, signage, if could access video relay for deaf customers available immediately
- When you think of accessibility – physical, importance of someone entering, having directions, info, is service counter accessible and the restrooms – in terms of communications – talk about deaf/no hearing – sign languages interpreter, closed captioning for any videos, plus languages for all this info – in looking at minimum criteria
- Couple of populations – diversity of languages in Seattle-King alone is huge – rest of state is mostly Spanish – then you have ABE populations lacking skills and PC skills – built into WIOA is that ABE has to be PRESENT in the One-Stop – and those people who receive WIOA funds are actively partnered in the one-stop and serving in a Unified Way – bring resources, et al
- We have lot of expectations of Monster Solution – SBCTC/ABE will be working to help ensure students go into it
- Mention of Seattle-King having ABE staff in 2 of 6 sites – onsite to forge partnership and hope to see more of this – BEST PRACTICE!
- Also – flip the other way and have students referred to one-stop – Joint System
- Part of change in WIOA requires of SBCTC/ABE is support local programs, encourage local programs, “require” local program to work in new way
- Checklist + contractual requirements are important
- **Need tangible sort of certification process that is focused on service delivery – what is strategy, who are partners and what is their role**

BUCKET – Partnership

BUCKET – Functional Teams

BUCKET – Data – economic and performance data to drive service delivery

- Strategy – measure that this is actually happening
- Use of data by center to drive their work – to career choices
- Adreon – basic data – EE, RET, earnings
- But the core of it is “am I getting what I need”, next level is on to an intensive program
- Kathy – why do we measure only parts of goals and what are our responsibilities under the law – **stop thinking of hand offs and rather keeping hands on for longer and by more partners to get to better outcomes**
- Agnes – make sure customers have clarity on opportunities to move forward
- Adreon 1. Is LMI available at Core Services 2. How is it being used to get to customer
- Tammie – do front line staff understand and are they able to use it with their customers
- Eva – what tools are there? – MM – description of Dem/Dec, regional reports, etc.
- Beth – lot of tools – Map Your Career, RLEs, etc.

BUCKET – Professional Development

- Some language in Certification process that demonstrates staff using these tools
- Some measurements of ability to use data to help customers [but how to measure this?]
- Not just LMI but **also the CQI data that includes customer satisfaction**

- What about evaluation of these certifications? In the past, Board has been primary evaluators
- Process - Application by WorkSource – visit, determination – but so caught up by signage, doorways – that it wasn’t as helpful as it could have been

- When it comes to programmatic and physical accessibility – have we brought in other experts to help with that process of evaluation, e.g., Centers for Independent Living?
- Have certification team have people with barriers on the team
 - The proposed new advisory committee would do this
- Bring voice of the customer to this process
- We have the opportunity to make suggestions for stuff like this as part of the certification process
- DEI and other grant work has provided resource for WDC to have Disability Navigators for many years and years – to assist job seekers and staff in learning how to better serve some disabled customers – had Disability Resource Coordinators
- LEP + Social barriers aren’t being met as well as they could be
- Important work – if we have populations we are not reaching as well as we could we need to reach out
- WIOA points to more populations to serve
- **Use EO Adverse Impact data and EO officers’ work to inform service delivery**

Connections Sites (and Affiliates)

- **System has evolved over the years and our state process needs to recognize these new portals into the system that leverage community partners and assets to provide customers with additional points of service and access to workforce system**
- Some areas have no affiliates or connection sites – **need to codify these portals**
- **Library has been phenomenal partner in a number of areas** – offer workshops, etc. – in even most outlying communities – **branding has been challenging at times**
- Evolution in Seattle-King: Moved to Connection Sites for colleges first to avoid requirements of inputting data into system – just link via web on services available at both and college and WorkSource – reciprocity of info
 - Now 21 sites – Seattle Library, King County Library – used Foundation funding to build out services to job seekers; no money changes hands – no budget – but have helped pay for signage at times
 - Let RFQ for Connection Sites – staff review, board members involved

- Seattle Housing Authority, King County Housing Authority are now sites – goal is to get connections in sites without WorkSource nearby – east King County, North Bend – **track web analytics data for usage rather than in SKIES**
- Recently **simplified process for real underrepresented populations – online application open all the time – not competitive procurement – vetted to have piece of what they do with their community’s workforce services, attend partnership meetings quarterly**
- Millionair Club – now a Connection Site and business model is more organized and focused upon how to assign work to people, DESC also Connection Site
- **In WIOA, can now open up connections to those that serve specialized populations**
- In Seattle-King, Community Teams are now going out in their neighborhoods doing outreach to identify where WorkSource services can be taken out of WS and into communities
- How to track, measure, count services provided via connection sites?
 - Alternative means: Workforce sign-up sheets, ask how many were served – hope that Monster will solve some of that – **point for them was to reduce onerous data entry**
- There were concerns over serving someone over another, had three issues – 1. Being able to utilize SKIES system in sites and confidentiality of system, i.e., partners worried about many people statewide being able to access client info 2. IT compatibility 3. A site only serving one population and not any others, e.g., disabled customers
- Question is how to enhance what is happening at point of service – if it’s Goodwill, help bring them additional services/resources **so they can serve their customers better**
- **Important that WDAs be able to use this alternative**
- Yes – there are issues with Connection Sites partners sometimes – don’t come to the quarterly meetings, don’t always come into compliance until right before certification
- **On Site Visits – ask: What is it we can bring to you to help you serve your customers better?**
- Haven’t seen errant collateral – always give out templates for them to use with proper logos/tagline, etc.

BUCKET – Employer Engagement

Mark M. will review the focal areas of interest and emphasis and areas to de-emphasize and streamline that we have established over the first four meetings and develop buckets.

He will then review all the documents and processes we have obtained from around the state and begin crafting/copying/pasting best practices and develop draft assessment tools for review at our next meeting.