

<b>WIOA Task Force/Subcommittee</b>	<b>Unified/Combined Plan Task Force</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Combined plan – New partners’ role in combined planning is to identify how the partners in the workforce system can help the new partner’s customers increase education and training, achieve job entry, retention, and earnings progression; and to indicate how the new partner can help the rest of the systems’ customers succeed on these same goals.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Recommend combined plan with as many partner programs as possible after consideration of mutually beneficial impacts to customers.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Non-core program partners who, after considering the proposal to be a part of combined planning, would like to opt out, should write the Governor and the Workforce Board and should identify the pros and cons to their position.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Non-core program partners who, after reading the proposal, would like to be included in combined planning, should write a letter to the Governor and the Workforce Board with a request to be included and identify the pros and cons of being included.</i></li> <li>5. <i>If, after a non-core partner program has been involved in combined planning for 2 years (with an update to strategic plan every 2 years), they do not want to continue to participate in combined planning, they would make an appeal to the Governor to opt out of continuing on in the combined plan.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Background</b>	<p>The Task Force (TF) met biweekly beginning April 23, 2015 through July 2, 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TF members were provided foundational information regarding the elements of both unified and combined plans, as well as the current workforce development system reporting methodologies regarding High Skills High Wages.</li> <li>• The TF worked to hone a vision of the ideal, collaborative and effective workforce development system in WA State and let that vision help inform the recommendation regarding selection of a unified or combined plan.</li> <li>• The TF thoroughly explored the potential impacts to partners and the overall system in considering the plan and reporting options. There was deep discussion regarding individual programs as well as specific agencies involved in the system: core programs/partner agencies, mandatory programs/partner agencies, and optional programs/partner agencies.</li> <li>• The TF sought to consider local and state-level impacts as well as a long term, outcomes and systems integration driven approach as opposed to a more short term approach which may have minimized the state’s initial (and overall) investment and participation, but be initially “easier.”</li> </ul>

<p><b>Who was engaged in this process?</b> <i>(Please provide a list of subcommittee or task force members and who they represent)</i></p>	<p>David Stillman (DSHS), Chair Eleni Papadakis (Workforce Board) Nova Gattman (Workforce Board) Eric Wolf (Workforce Board) Terri Colbert (Workforce Board) Louisa Erickson (DSHS) Ellen Nolan, DSHS Tamara Jones (DSHS) Tim Probst (ESD) William Durden (SBCTC) Marie Bruin (SBCTC) Anna Nikolaeva (SBCTC) Mat Carlisle (SBCTC) John Bowers (SSCC) Darlene Snider (WWCC) Mihaela Cosma (LWTC) Betty Klattenhoff (OSPI) Phouang Hamilton (OSPI) Denny Wallace (OSPI) Shani Watkins (Seattle Schools) Diane Klontz (Commerce ) Tony Hanson (Commerce) Joyce Beebe (Commerce) Mark Adreon (DSB) Michael Mackillop (DSB) Kathy DiJulio (WWA) Karen Manuel (WDC) Erin Monroe (WDC) Danielle Wallace (WDC) Del DelaBarre (WDC) Don Kay (DVR) Kim Justice (WA Center for Budget &amp;Policy) Amy Diehr (Tacoma Community House) Jason Scales (Tacoma Community House) Karen Hay (WANIC Skill Center) Lindsey Blanding (The Prosperity Agenda) Diana Dollar (The Prosperity Agenda) David Hartman (The Prosperity Agenda) Chloe Kachscovsky (The Prosperity Agenda) Jim Kenny (AL TSA) John Cooper (Results Washington) KayLyne Newell (Results Washington) Troy McClelland (Econ. Alliance, Snohomish County)</p>
<p><b>What, if any, is the minority recommendation?</b></p>	<p>The majority of opinion supported combined planning, with representatives from one organization (SBCTC) dissenting with a vote for unified planning; and OSPI representatives abstaining for reasons of feeling they did not have enough information about potential</p>

Tab 3 Attachment D  
Unified/Combined Plan

	<p>impacts to commit to a position at this time. The position related to selection of a unified plan was primarily driven by concerns about the potential effects on two particular programs: Perkins - which is administered by the Workforce Board, and Basic Food Employment and Training – which is administered by DSHS and for which SBCTC and the community and technical colleges play a key partnership role in implementation.</p>
<p><b>Are there any unresolved issues?</b></p>	<p>While the vast majority of TF members did vote to recommend a combined plan with the five point proposal included in this document, there were many discussions and some concerns regarding the unknown impacts relevant to programs in terms of funds allocation, program authority over services and activities, additional resource, data, reporting, and staffing investments that may be required by participating in combined planning.</p>